

Brill's Companion to Roman Tragedy

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

Brill's Companions in Classical Studies

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/bccs*

Brill's Companion to Roman Tragedy

Edited by

George W.M. Harrison



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Cover illustration: Walter Richard Sickert, *The Brighton Pierrots*. WA2001.29 ©Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Brill's companion to Roman tragedy / edited by George W.M. Harrison.

pages cm — (Brill's companions in classical studies)

ISBN 978-90-04-23159-7 (hardback : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-28478-4 (e-book)

1. Latin drama (Tragedy)—History and criticism. I. Harrison, George William Mallory. II. Series: Brill's companions in classical studies.

PA6068.B75 2015

872'.0109—dc23

2015020425

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual 'Brill' typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1872-3357

ISBN 978-90-04-23159-7 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-28478-4 (e-book)

Copyright 2015 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Contents

Editor's Foreword ix

Author Summaries xvii

PART 1

Republic

Editing Roman (Republican) Tragedy: Challenges and Possible
Solutions 3

Gesine Manuwald

The Argo Killed Hippolytus: Roman Tragedy in the (Meta-)Theatre 24

Mario Erasmo

Roman Tragedy—Ciceronian Tragedy? Cicero's Influence on Our
Perception of Republican Tragedy 45

Petra Schierl

240 BCE and All That: The Romanness of Republican Tragedy 63

Robert Cowan

PART 2

Empire

The *editio* of Roman Tragedy 93

Thomas D. Kohn

Rhetorical Tragedy: The Logic of Declamation 105

David Konstan

Seneca on the Fall of Troy 118

George W.M. Harrison

Seneca's *Thyestes* and the Political Tradition in Roman Tragedy 151

P.J. Davis

PART 3

Interchange with Other Genres

Epic Elements in Senecan Tragedy 171

Annette M. Baertschi

The Reception of Latin Archaic Tragedy in Ovid's Elegy 196

Marco Filippi

Tragic Rome? Roman Historical Drama and the Genre of Tragedy 216

Lauren Donovan Ginsberg

Roman Tragedy and Philosophy 238

Christopher Star

Theatrical Language and Philosophical Issues in Seneca's Tragedies: Cued and Unannounced Entrances (Especially *Oedipus* 81 and 784) 260

Jean-Pierre Aygon

Roman Tragedy through a Comic Lens 283

Niall W. Slater

PART 4

Seneca after Antiquity

Schlegel, Shelley and the "Death" of Seneca 311

Helen Slaney

Seneca Tragicus in the Twentieth Century: Hugo Claus' Adaptations of *Thyestes*, *Oedipus* and *Phaedra* 330

Betine van Zyl Smit

T.S. Eliot's Seneca 348

Gregory A. Staley

*Afterword***A Day at the Races Theatre: The Spectacle of Performance in the Roman****Empire 367***George W.M. Harrison***Bibliography 389****General Index 421****Index of Ancient Authors and Passages 435**

Editor's Foreword

The genesis of this volume was the appearance of *Brill's Companion to the Study of Greek Comedy* (ed. Gregory Dobrov, 2010). It occurred to me as I spoke to Caroline van Erp of Brill at the Annual Meeting of the [then] American Philological Association at San Antonio in January, 2011, that the press might consider, because scholarship might welcome, a four book suite, one each on Greek Comedy, Roman Comedy, Greek Tragedy and Roman Tragedy. An agreement to put together a companion to Roman tragedy was made in May, 2011, when a pause in the editing of the manuscript of *Performance in Greek and Roman Theatre* (with Vayos Liapis, 2013), also a Brill publication, allowed some time to consider my next project.

As always, the commitment of authors to other projects and thus their potential availability for one on Roman tragedy took months. Further, a number of potential topics and contributors contemplated for this volume, were anticipated by *Brill's Companion to Seneca* (edited by Gregor Damschen and Andreas Heil, 2014). This was a happy co-incidence since it allowed a tighter focus for this volume. Over-lapping production with *Brill's Companion to Seneca* has meant that several of the authors to this volume were able to access the Seneca companion only through private communication or advance proofs, which Brill graciously made available. Similarly, a special issue of *Pallas*, dedicated to Seneca, appeared only at the end of 2014, edited by Aygon, one of the contributors to this volume. There is much in the *Pallas* volume of interest to contributors to this volume, such as Schiesaro on the Entropy of Tragedy, Klees and Mignacca on the *Phaedra*, Staley on the *Oedipus*, and Kugelmeier on staging.

Roman tragedy has existed in the twilight of Greek tragedy: it seems to me that Roman tragedy is still attempting to answer questions that have been resolved for a long time for Greek tragedy, such as the inter-change between comedy and tragedy, and that Roman drama still grapples with questions, such as performance and performability, that one would never think to ask of Greek tragedy. It would seem essential, as well, to bring experts on Republican tragedy into engagement with experts on Imperial tragedy. In scholarship to date, the influence of Greek tragedy on Roman Imperial tragedy is foregrounded for the sole reason that we have complete, or nearly complete, texts for both. The case for the priority of the influence of Republican tragedy on Imperial tragedy needs to be made because it is logically, geographically, and historically, the more compelling one. *Oderint dum metuant*, for example, is quoted in nearly every contribution; it is a quintessentially Roman sentiment used equally by

Republican and Imperial writers (prose and verse) and politicians. The peculiar hold of the myth of Troy on the Roman imagination transcended both the Republic and Empire; Aeneas is perhaps the only ancient figure, either real or fictional, to have both a tragedy and a historical drama. The uniqueness and unity of male and female characterization on the Roman stage stands in distinction to Greek positioning.

The main issues about, especially, Imperial tragedy are still very much in dispute and it is not intention of this volume to privilege one opinion over another but rather to present the most thoughtful, and thought provocative, approaches to the questions that still linger and to let the papers speak for themselves. The information is put so that the reader can discover ways in which Republican tragedy can illuminate Imperial tragedy, and perhaps on the reverse, and resolve some of the debates. Shakespeare knew who Seneca was with a certainty that has not been possible since then. The rise of closet drama, that is, dramas meant for circulation and not performance, in eighteenth century Europe and particularly the failure of dramas, such as Shelley's *Cenci*, to book a theatre made it possible to take Seneca off the stage. Through the efforts of Ahl and Stroh, and others, one would have thought that the scholarly quarrel had been resolved in favor of performance, but papers in this volume show the debate is still robust. The unity of historical drama, between the Republic and Empire has been argued against a view that has seemed dogmatic in setting up opposites in two columns for the periods. A more nuanced presentation of the evidence, however, is moving towards a re-establishing of ways in which historical drama of the Empire could not be like that of the Republic.

So, too, recent fashion has assigned the *Octavia* and *Hercules Oetaeus* to hands other than Seneca's. In a time of reconsidering claims for authenticity of the epigrams attributed to Seneca and the letters purporting an exchange between Seneca and St. Paul, the *Hercules Oetaeus* is attracting reasoned defense of Senecan authorship. The amount of Roman investment in the Trojan war cycle and, more importantly, whether such plays, to the extent one can defend subject matter and presentation, reflect growing philhellenism or conversely posit an 'anti-hellenism' in which the audience is to cheer Trojans as somehow 'proto-Romans' are matters on which authors in this volume hold different views. Staley in his review of the *Brill Companion to Seneca* in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, notes that "Seneca, who long suffered from the mistaken notion that he was two different people, now suffers from the opposite, as more recently scholars have sought to create a coherence between the poetry and philosophy of a sort which Seneca himself never provided." Two contributions to this volume respond to the challenge implicit in the quotation considering the evidence from very different perspectives.

The first papers in this collection address the question of Republican tragedy starting with **Gesine Manuwald's** piece on the limitations and opportunities of editing the remains of Republican tragedy. Her work on the new edition of the fragments makes her one of the most respected experts in this field and the new edition of *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta* will doubtless spur much more research on the Republican tragedians. Intertexts between Seneca's *Phaedra* and Euripides' *Hippolytus* have already been remarked by scholars. **Mario Erasmo** sees the influence of Accius, among others, on Seneca, considering intertext a form of meta-theatre, especially when that influence crosses genre boundaries or, as in this case, adapts from plays in other myth cycles, such as Jason and Medea, and hence "Argo" in the title. "Eliot's influence on Shakespeare" is oft repeated since the fictional MA thesis topic lampooned by David Lodge in his novel *Small World* (1984) but in a very real sense Eliot shaped how we approach Shakespeare. **Petra Schierl** has made a parallel case for Cicero. The single greatest source for quotations of the Republican tragedians (as Plutarch is for Greek tragedians), Cicero, particularly through the context of speeches, letters, and philosophical essays in which the quotations are made and used, shaped how Romans of the late Republic and early Empire appreciated the Republican tragedians. **Robert Cowan** attacks the notion that Republican Roman tragedy (and here I think the indictment can be applied to all Roman tragedy) was a series of incompetent imitations of Greek tragedy. His careful examination of what can be known of Republican tragedy suggests much less reliance on Greek stories for the broad canvas of selection of topics; in the details of the writing and performance, other lines of influence, and originality, become more apparent.

The next four papers look more narrowly at the tragedies of Seneca. **Thomas D. Kohn** starts with the observation that, even for Republican tragedies, our surviving authorities give indications that they are reading texts of the plays, even if they had before (or after) seen that play in performance. Circulation of plays of "gentleman poets", to baldarize a condemnation from Yeats, during the transition from Republic to Empire are known, for example, because of Augustus' efforts to suppress texts of Caesar's plays and his own juvenilia. "Publication" (i.e., "private reading") opens a third option in the continuing discussion over performance *versus* recitation. This leads seamlessly to **David Konstan's** paper on declamation and rhetoric, which acknowledges the deep debt it owes to a recent PhD thesis by Lucia Degiovanni. Konstan examines the first 705 lines of the *Hercules Oetaeus* from the viewpoint of the tautness of its rhetoric and the judiciousness of choice of allusions. His conclusion that the *Hercules Oetaeus* represents a first draft by Seneca himself will re-open scholarly debate on authorship of the *Hercules Oetaeus*. **George W.M.**

Harrison's brief is his by now familiar one that the plays of Seneca were written for performance and were performed during his lifetime. The evidence is, again, circumstantial, but looks to the influence of Republican dramas on the Trojan cycle, all of which were performed, on Seneca's *Troades* to suggest the importance of Republican drama for its Imperial heir. Peter J. Davis on the *Thyestes* continues Harrison's exploration of the Republican roots of Imperial drama, and focuses on how the *Thyestes*, and by extension other Imperial dramas, can be read as critiques of contemporary politics. His review of Livius Andronicus and Naevius, especially, place Seneca's plays in the context of embracing and continuing a long tradition of the Roman tragic stage. "Romanization" in archaeology has largely been repudiated but, as Davis argues, "Romanization" was an important aspect of Roman tragedy of all periods and authors, an argument made also by Cowan for the Republic.

Six papers examine the relationship of other genres to Roman tragedy and all six consider the reciprocal influence of those genres on tragedy and of tragedy on them. Annette M. Baertschi makes the case for the influence of Virgil, and epic in general, on Seneca, as adaptations from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* are frequent in Erasmo's contribution. Baertschi focuses on messenger speeches, particularly in the *Hercules furens* (Theseus) and *Agamemnon*, and observes that the ecphrasis in these long accounts is strongly reminiscent of Greek and Latin epic. "Rhetoric" for Baertschi, as "declamation" for Konstan, is a term of approbation and a practice that links the dramatic and epic poets to one another. Marco Filippi looks at the *doctrina*, that is, the "learning" that was so much a part of elegiac poetry focusing on Ovid and Ovid's flirtation with tragedy but more important Ovid's parsing of the Republican tragedians in his love poetry and the *Heroides*. Filippi chooses *Heroides* 12 (Medea to Jason) and *Heroides* 16 and 17 (exchange between Paris and Helen) as his case studies. Medea occurs in several of Ovid's poems and was the topic of his (now lost) tragedy and Filippi is shrewd to observe that Medea in the *Heroides* transforms herself from the "elegiac Medea" to the "tragic Medea". Hecuba's dream is one of the most powerful scenes in all of Latin poetry and Filippi shows how the lines in Ennius' *Alexander* become part of recriminations between Paris and Helen. Lauren Donovan Ginsberg takes another, and deeper, look at the two contentious issues bedeviling an understanding of historical drama, that is, the closeness of its relationship to tragedy and the relationship between Republican and Imperial historical drama (*praetext[at]a*). Ribbeck included historical drama at the end of the final volume of his edition of the *Tragicorum romanorum fragmenta*, almost as an apology or afterthought, which well describes continued scholarly opinion. Ginsberg builds on special issues of *Symbolae Osloensis* (ed. P. Kragelund, 2002) and *Prudentia* (ed. M. Wilson, 2003) to

conclude that historical drama sought to sever itself from mythological tragedy, staking ground as its own genre, but never did so successfully. Her view of the continuity of historical drama is nuanced: if one considers the *Octavia* alone, it has strong links with formal aspects and the celebratory nature of composition and performance of Republican *praetexta*. The dramatic invectives of Maternus (Tacitus *Dialogus de oratoribus*) problematize the picture for Ginsberg as they have for others. She concludes, however, observing the influence of Accius' *Brutus*, that "Roman politics are highly theatrical and Roman theater highly political", associating tragedy with *praetexta*, and Republican *praetexta* with Imperial *praetexta* across its long history by the similar background and motives they shared.

The question of the relationship of Seneca's tragedy to philosophy has been debated for centuries with Rosenmeyer (1989) stating the *opinio consensus* that is still reflected in *Brill's Companion to Seneca* (2014; see S.E. Fischer 745–68). **Christopher Star** moves the discussion forward by first examining what can be inferred about the place of philosophy in Republican tragedy. A critique of Stoic concepts emerges from citation of the fragments as well as from other Republican authors, such as Cicero and even Plautus. If Star is right that Seneca's plays to some degree react against dismissal of Stoicism in Republican tragedy and a similar dismissal of Stoicism in Cicero's remarks on plays (as is almost certainly correct), then Seneca's plays take on a dimension that make the debate about Seneca's Stoicism more complex, as they become, at least in part, a conversation Seneca is having with his predecessors across the centuries. **Jean-Pierre Aygon**'s contribution proves Star's point. Aygon is, refreshingly, not interested in the question of performance. For him, the influence of the plays on public life and private philosophy is the most important consideration and they would have had that effect regardless of the manner in which they were received. Aygon differentiates Senecan practice on entrances and exits from Attic tragedy since in his view the degree to which an entrance was cued was a clue to the significance of what was to transpire. His case study is Seneca's *Oedipus* and he focuses on the scenes in which Jocasta appears on stage (81) and the dialogue of Oedipus and Jocasta with the elder from Corinth who appears at line 784. The two scenes reveal the culpability of Oedipus and of Jocasta each of whom recognizes his/her guilt privately but hides that knowledge from others. **Niall W. Slater** has collected the evidence to show how Roman comedy tells us how Republican tragedy looked and what it sounded like. The picture that emerges is of an extremely vibrant theatrical scene in which comedy parodies tragedy, sometimes willfully misunderstands tragedy, sometimes over-plays tragedy for comic effect. The jokes work because the comic audience would have seen the referenced tragedies. Of special interest to

Slater are madness scenes in comedy which take liberties with tragic language and stage action but in a way that "Romanizes" Greek mythological content ("Plautinopolis" in Slater, taken from Gratwick) as appropriation, also noticed by Davis.

The last three papers help reconstruct the aesthetics of the Senecan stage by showing how changing aesthetics in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries required significant structural and thematic changes in adaptations of Seneca by his successors, such as Shelley and Hugo Claus, and in Seneca's critics, such as Schlegel and Eliot. **Helen Slaney** starts with a series of extremely influential lectures by Schlegel in 1808 which established the orthodoxy of the perfection of Greek tragedy and dismissed the tragedies of Seneca as a "regrettable episode in theatrical history". Kleist's *Penthesilea* (1811) drew upon Seneca's *Phaedra* for inspiration, if unacknowledged, among other sources, in which the Amazon queen falls in love with Achilles but eventually murders him. Its violence kept it from full production for decades. One scene, presuming a Senecan model, was almost entirely an extended monologue delivered by a messenger. Violence, plus indications of incest, kept Shelley's *Cenci* (1818) off the stage, much to his annoyance. As a revenge drama, its Senecan pedigree, particularly the *Thyestes* via Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, is transparent. The Victorian era was one that wanted "genteel morals and sentimental plots". Hugo Claus, whose work receives a major appraisal by **Betine van Zyl Smit** is little known to English audiences but has a large following on the continent. His *Oedipus* (1971), *Thyestes* (1980), and *Phaedra* (1984) are written in the tradition of Artaud's (1961) "theatre of cruelty". Claus was drawn to surrealistic scenes in Seneca, such as necromancy, giving them more lines than they had in Seneca's own version. Claus, however, found the monologues and choral odes too long for his audiences and so broke them up into dialogues, when he retained them. Claus' vision is apocalyptic: the brothers embrace as the curtain comes down on his *Thyestes*, signifying the love of evil is a form of love stronger than love itself.

Eliot is chronologically between Schlegel-Kleist-Shelley and Claus but was saved to the end because of his seminal 1927 essays on Shakespeare and Seneca. Eliot's love-hate relationship with the plays of Seneca remains one of the key moments in the interpretation of Senecan drama, and by extension of Republican and Imperial tragedy in general. It is significant that Eliot in his mind did not seem capable of divorcing Seneca from Elizabethan drama: the contribution of **Gregory A. Staley** recognizes two Eliots, as Filippi saw two Medeas in Ovid's *Heroides*. Eliot the dramatist read Seneca as preparation for writing his own verse tragedies. Eliot disdained "closet drama" and his admiration for Seneca as a writer (different from as a thinker) was based in

part on his conviction that the plays were written for performance and staged. The futility and anarchy in Seneca appealed to Eliot as a metaphor for his own world [as later also to Claus during the Cold War]. Eliot, soon after he came into contact with Pound, left philosophy for poetry and remained, as Staley shows, uncomfortable about the relationship of philosophy and poetry. In his mind they were different categories with strong partition walls between them. Staley sees that Eliot sometimes fails to perceive things in Seneca because he does not see them in himself: Seneca, for example, would not object to readings of plays that are philosophical; he, however, has no liking for didacticism. Staley concludes with a long section on "Eliot the Man" in which he argues that what appealed about Seneca to Eliot was that Eliot perceived that they had very similar interests and personalities.

An afterword has been added on the spectacle of the performance of Roman tragedy in the Empire as a counter-weight to what is known of the performance of comedy in the Republic, some of which is alluded to by Slater. The changes in staging are of great importance in trying to understand the differences between Republican and Imperial tragedy. When information is available, the playwright was involved in production and so one assumes the play was configured for the conventions of the stage. Further, Ciceronian understanding of the staging of plays in the Republic and of the division of seating of the social orders bears little similarity to what evidence suggests, albeit all of it outside Rome, for the Empire. The reserved sections, novelties, and side entertainments all suggest that tragedy retained its mass appeal in the Empire, in no little part (so Suetonius in a key passage in his *Life of Nero*) because of its connection to the celebration of the imperial cult.

It will be noticed that this volume has foregone the normal detailed introduction of the history of scholarship on the subject. It has not seemed necessary since several individual contributions, such as Manuwald for the Republic, Kohn for the Empire and Staley and Slaney for the post-antique period, have done a review of scholarship as thorough as any in which the editor might engage. Further, it would, I think pointlessly, reduplicate what has been done in the recent *Brill Companion to Seneca*. It seems reasonable that readers of this volume will look at that one also. All abbreviations follow those of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, *Oxford Classical Dictionary*,⁴ *Oxford Greek Dictionary*, and *L'Année Philologique*. Citations are those of the *Oxford Classical Texts*, except when comparison is made to other editions, and translations are usually those of the author unless otherwise stated. Exceptions have been made for the Loeb text and translation of Seneca's plays by John Fitch. Brill style has been followed throughout except that full names and titles are made in the text, and abbreviations in the notes. This deviation was found useful for papers

in which *Phaedra* instantly made Seneca intelligible from Racine's *Phedre*, for example. Having done so in several contributions, it seemed best to extend the practice to all.

This project would not have been possible without the initial encouragement of Caroline van Erp and the encouragement, to which has been added much patience of Tessel Jonquiere, and now that also of Tessa Schild and Dinah Rapliza. Stephanie Maurel, of Concordia and now at Durham, gave extraordinary amounts of her time to editing papers and verifying references. Her efforts are greatly appreciated. The intelligence and breadth of reading of George Sokrates Viron were apparent instantaneously from when I first met him four years ago, and he has never disappointed nor ceased to amaze. He won a major grant from Concordia University that allowed him to devote his time and attention to this project. Versions of the preface have been read by Jean-Pierre Aygon, Annette M. Baertschi, David Konstan, Petra Schierl and Greg Staley. I thank them for their corrections and suggestions. As always, it would have been impossible even to consider the possibility of this project without the support of my colleague and spouse, Jane Francis.

George W.M. Harrison

Hudson, Québec, 30 March 2015

Author Summaries

Jean-Pierre Aygon

maître de conférences, HDR, Université de Toulouse 2, is especially interested in Seneca's tragedies, rhetoric and poetry. He has published *Pictor in fabula: La descriptio-ecphrasis dans les tragédies de Sénèque*. He has co-organized several symposia and edited their proceedings, among which are *Mythes et savoirs dans les textes grecs et latins* (2008), *La mythologie de l'Antiquité à la Modernité* (2009), and *Sénèque, un philosophe homme de théâtre?* (2014). His monograph on Seneca *Vt scaena uita: Mise en scène et dévoilement dans les œuvres philosophiques et dramatiques de Sénèque* will appear in 2015.

Annette M. Baertschi

is Associate Professor of Classics at Bryn Mawr College. Her research focuses on Roman literature, especially imperial poetry, Greek and Latin epic, ancient drama and performance as well as the reception of the classical world. She has recently published a monograph on necromancy in Neronian and Flavian epic (Berlin 2013) and also co-edited a large essay collection, *Die modernen Väter der Antike. Die Entwicklung der Altertumswissenschaften an Akademie und Universität in Berlin des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin 2009).

Robert Cowan

is Senior Lecturer in Classics at the University of Sydney. His research interests range over much of Greek and Latin poetry, and he has published on Sophocles, Aristophanes, Plautus, Lucretius, Catullus, Cicero, Cinna, Tivida, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Columella, Martial, Suetonius and Juvenal, as well as ancient graffiti and the operatic reception of Greek tragedy. However, his main specialisms are Flavian epic and Republican tragedy. He is currently completing three books: *Virgil's Aeneid* (Bloomsbury), *After Virgil* (Liverpool), and a monograph on Silius Italicus (OUP).

P.J. Davis

is a Visiting Research Fellow at the University of Adelaide and an Adjunct Associate Professor at the University of Tasmania. He is author of three books, *The Chorus in Seneca's Tragedies*, *Seneca: Thyestes*, *Ovid and Augustus: A Political Reading of Ovid's Erotic Poetry*, as well as co-editor of *The Art of Veiled Speech. Self-Censorship from Aristophanes to Hobbes*. He currently works on Flavian epic.

Mario Erasmo

is Professor of Classics at the University of Georgia specializing in the Legacy of Classical Antiquity. He is the author of *Archaic Latin Verse* (2001), *Roman Tragedy: Theatre to Theatricality* (2004); *Reading Death in Ancient Rome* (2008); *Death: Antiquity And Its Legacy* (2012) and is editor of *The Cultural History of Death in Antiquity* (2016). Drawing from years of experience leading academic and private tours throughout Europe, he is the series editor of IB Tauris' "Strolling Through" series for which he is the author of *Strolling Through Rome: The Definitive Walking Guide to the Eternal City* (2015) and *Strolling Through Florence: The Definitive Walking Guide to the Renaissance City* (2016).

Marco Filippi

Sapienza University (Rome, Italy), works chiefly on Latin theatre, particularly on tragedies. He has published a commentary on Accius' *Andromeda* (Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei) and a paper on the *Armorum iudicium* by the same poet. He is preparing a paper about the relationship between Latin archaic tragedy and Propertius' elegies. He has been working for many years on an edition with commentary on the fragments of Latin tragedians.

Lauren Donovan Ginsberg

University of Cincinnati, focuses on Roman Imperial drama, epic, and historiography. She is particularly interested in Rome's literature of civil war as well as in the intersection of history and poetry. She has published several articles on Seneca's *Phoenissae* and on the pseudo-Senecan *Octavia*. She is also at work on a larger monograph on the *Octavia*'s reception of the literature and cultural memory of the Julio-Claudian age.

George W.M. Harrison

Carleton University (Ottawa), has devoted much of his career to the question of the performance of Seneca's plays. He has edited or co-edited books on *Seneca in Performance* and *Performance in Greek and Roman Theatre* (Brill) and has contributed to *Brill's Companion to Seneca* and to *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Aeschylus*. He is preparing parallel readers' guides to the *Octavia* and to the *Hercules Oetaeus*. He has begun work on a volume on Seneca and Plutarch.

Thomas D. Kohn

Associate Professor of Classics at Wayne State University (Detroit), has focused his work on Ancient Theatre (mostly Seneca *tragicus*, but also Euripides,

Ezekiel and Vergil), Mythology and Performance Criticism. His first book, *The Dramaturgy of Senecan Tragedy*, published by the University of Michigan Press, examines elements of dramaturgy and stagecraft in the genuine plays of Seneca *tragicus*. He is currently working on studies of dramaturgy in the pseudo-Senecan *Octavia* and *Hercules Oetaeus*. Wayne State University recently awarded him a Career Development Chair, during which he is continuing work on his next book project, an examination of Narrative Interruption of *Oratio Recta* in Roman literature.

David Konstan

New York University, has worked on various aspects of Greek and Roman literature and philosophy. Among his recent books are *Pity Transformed* (2001); *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature* (2006); *"A Life Worthy of the Gods": The Materialist Psychology of Epicurus* (2008); *Before Forgiveness: The Origins of a Moral Idea* (2010); and *Beauty: The Fortunes of an Ancient Greek Idea* (2014). He has translated Seneca's *Hercules on Mount Oeta* and *Hercules Furens* into verse for the forthcoming Chicago University complete works of Seneca in translation, and published several articles on Seneca's conception of the emotions. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a past president of the American Philological Association.

Gesine Manuwald

is Professor of Latin at University College London. Her research focuses on Roman drama, Roman epic, Roman oratory and the reception of classical literature, particularly in Neo-Latin poetry, and she has published widely on all those areas. Her work on Roman drama includes a study on the genre of the *fabula prae-texta* (2001), a monograph on the tragic poet Pacuvius (2003), a Roman drama reader (2010), a survey of Roman Republican theatre (2011) and a scholarly edition of the fragments of Ennius' tragedies (2012). She is currently working on a Loeb edition of Ennius' fragments.

Petra Schierl

teaches as Privatdozentin at the University of Basel and held a visiting professorship at the Humboldt University Berlin in the winter semester 2014/15. She has worked on Republican tragedy and published a commentary on Pacuvius (*Die Tragödien des Pacuvius*, Berlin 2006). From the fragments of Roman drama she has moved to bucolic poetry and is currently preparing a monograph on the deified benefactors in Vergil's *Eclogues*. Another main focus of her research

is the poetry of Late Antiquity: she has co-edited the volume *Lateinische Poesie der Spätantike* (Basel 2009) and has published on Rutilius Namatianus, Paulinus, Prudentius, and on Christian bucolic poetry.

Helen Slaney

is a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellow at St Hilda's College, Oxford. In 2013 she completed her doctorate on the performance history of Senecan tragedy, which is due to be published in 2015 by Oxford University Press. She has also published on Roman tragic pantomime, and has been involved in practice-based performance research into ancient dance. Her current research focuses on embodied receptions of ancient material culture in the late eighteenth century.

Niall W. Slater

Samuel Candler Dobbs Professor of Latin and Greek, Emory University, focuses on the ancient theatre and its production conditions, the later reception of classical drama, and prose fiction. His books include *Spectator Politics: Metatheatre and Performance in Aristophanes* (Penn 2002); *Reading Petronius* (JHUP, 1990); and *Plautus in Performance: The Theatre of the Mind* (Princeton, 1985; 2nd, revised edition 2000), as well as translations of Middle Comedy for *The Birth of Comedy* (ed. J.R. Rusten, JHUP, 2011). His Bloomsbury Companion to Euripides' *Alcestis* appeared in 2013. Current work includes studies of Harley Granville Barker's 1915 American tour with productions of *Trojan Women* and *Iphigenia in Tauris* and classical memories in C.S. Lewis's children's books.

Gregory A. Staley

University of Maryland (College Park), works on Seneca and the reception of the Classics in the United States. He has written *Seneca and the Idea of Tragedy* (Oxford 2010) and edited *American Women and Classical Myths* (Baylor 2008). He has recently published "Making Oedipus Roman" in *Pallas*, "Rip Van Winkle's Odyssey" in *Greece and Rome*, and "Hawthorne's Ovidian Transformations" in *Classical Receptions Journal*. His chapter, "Freud's Vergil," appeared in *Myth and Psychoanalysis* (Oxford 2012).

Christopher Star

Associate Professor of Classics, Middlebury College, focuses his research and teaching on the culture of the late Roman Republic and early Empire. He has written on Seneca's drama and philosophy and is the author of *The Empire of the Self: Self-Command and Political Speech in Seneca and Petronius*. He is currently completing an introduction to the life and works of Seneca.

Betine Van Zyl Smit

Associate Professor of Classics, University of Nottingham, focuses her research on the tragedies of Seneca and the reception of ancient literature, especially drama. She has published extensively on the reception of Classical drama in South Africa. She is the editor of Wiley-Blackwell's *Handbook to the Reception of Greek Drama* which will be published in 2015.

PART 1

Republic



Editing Roman (Republican) Tragedy: Challenges and Possible Solutions

Gesine Manuwald

1 Introduction

‘Literary’ Roman literature evolved around 240 BC, as is generally accepted, but from the early period prior to the first century BC little remains: Cato’s *De agricultura* is the only prose work and Plautus’ and Terence’s comedies are the only pieces in poetry surviving in (almost) complete form. Names of writers and titles, fragments and testimonia found in the writings of later authors reveal that there was much more literature in a variety of genres, which is no longer extant or only remains in fragments. Roman tragedy is one of the literary genres affected by this situation: all that is available in full are the imperial pieces transmitted under Seneca’s name, while everything else has been lost or reduced to fragments. At the same time, it is acknowledged that early tragedy (like early stages of other genres) was important for the development of Roman literature and culture and has had an impact on later works in the same and other literary genres. Hence it is necessary to make an attempt to find out as much about it as possible or at least define the limits of what can be determined for sure.

Problems, however, start with the establishment of the text. Yet the text is the basis on which clarity needs to be achieved before any further ‘detective’ work on the fragments can be undertaken. Hence this contribution will describe and illustrate the methodological challenges of working with fragmentary Roman tragedies (some of which also apply to fragmentary texts in other literary genres), outline some of the approaches that have been taken in the history of scholarship and indicate ways to overcome these issues where possible. Both an editor’s and a user’s perspective will be considered, for in order to assess the material presented, users should realize what work has been done by editors.¹

1 This chapter was written in conjunction with preparing a new edition of Ennius’ tragic fragments (*Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta* [TrRF]. Vol. II. Ennius, Göttingen 2012), when the issues discussed here had to be confronted (cf. also *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta* [TrRF]. Vol. I. Livius Andronicus, Naevius, *Tragici Minores*, *Adespota*, Göttingen 2012). While the preface to TrRF outlines the principles adopted for that edition, this contribution takes

2 Terminology, Sources and Scholarship

All fragments of Roman tragedy have been preserved in the secondary tradition, i.e. as quotations in later authors, ranging from the Auctor ad Herennium, Cicero and Varro in the first century BC to late-antique lexicographers, grammarians and commentators and even a few early medieval authors.² These writers do not quote extracts from Roman tragedies (and other works) because they wish to preserve them for later scholars, but to use them for their own purposes as part of their argument. For them the quoted piece was not a 'fragment', but rather a passage from a complete text. Hence, the frequent expression that an ancient author quotes a 'fragment' is incorrect; and this raises the larger question of what constitutes a 'fragment' and how a 'fragment' differs from a 'testimonium'. As a consequence of these difficulties, some people prefer the more neutral term 'remains' (*reliquiae*). Yet, if one is aware of the artificiality of the concept 'fragment', it will still be a useful term for denoting extracts quoted verbatim.³

Further, because of their aims in citing material, lexicographers and grammarians often quote extracts to illustrate the meaning or use of (in their view) uncommon words and constructions: on the one hand, this creates the impression that there is a disproportionately high number of unusual words in early Roman tragedy, and on the other hand, this results in a number of extant lines that do not represent complete sentences and may not be the most significant for the plot or message of the play. Authors like Cicero, by contrast, typically refer to lines or passages because they use them in a discursive argument; they tend to quote longer and more meaningful sections. However, the meaning they assign to these pieces may not be identical with the text's original meaning, and one cannot be sure of the reliability of the quotation, which may be from memory or adapted to the argument (as quotations from authors whose work is extant in full suggest). While the ways in which later authors have dealt

a broader view and describes the challenges facing editors and users of fragmentary editions and possible solutions in principle, for thoughts on these issues with respect to Ennius' *Annales* cf. now Elliott (2013).

- 2 A passage from the comedy *Obolostates sive Faenerator* by the Republican poet Caecilius Statius (*PHerc.* 78) and extracts of Ennius' epic *Annales* (*PHerc.* 21) have been found among the papyri from Herculaneum; cf. Kleve (1990); (1996); (2001). The deciphered Kleve 1990; 1996; 2001; but the deciphered papyri have not yielded any remains of Roman tragedy yet.
- 3 For some thoughts and discussion of the definition and origin of 'fragments' as well as on the reasons, purposes and methods for collecting 'fragments', cf. the essays collected in Most (1997).

with Roman tragedy reveals a lot about the reception of this literary genre, this means that in most cases one cannot just look at the fragment itself, but needs to take account of the context in which it is quoted, i.e. the surrounding or framing text.

Nowadays, early Roman tragedy is not normally read by studying another ancient author's work and engaging with fragments when one comes across them, but rather by consulting dedicated editions: scholars since the 16th century have been going through the surviving body of Roman literature, have extracted quotations of tragedies and collected them in separate editions.⁴ These efforts have proved extremely useful and make accessing tragic texts more convenient for readers; yet approaching tragic fragments in such collections means that the perception of early Roman tragedy is shaped by the way in which editors present the text to a greater degree than in the case of completely surviving works. For instance, the amount of context provided or the order in which the pieces are given vary between different editions, and this may have consequences for the interpretation of the fragments.

Equally, an edition of Roman tragedy or of a single tragic poet consists of excerpts from a variety of later Latin writers. Therefore, an edition of a fragmentary text does not simply reproduce the established text of a single work with a coherent manuscript tradition, but is rather based on the transmission and manuscript traditions of the writings of many different authors. Hence it is often not possible for editors of collections of fragments to study the manuscripts of all the transmitting writers themselves and they therefore rely on the most authoritative editions available for those authors. Also, since the text of the tragic fragments is frequently difficult or corrupt, many editors put conjectures into the text or add assumed names of speakers, to present readers with a text that makes sense. This procedure may be justified and helpful in some cases, if the editorial intervention is signalled clearly. Owing to the particular challenges for editors of fragmentary texts, every edition of Roman tragic fragments is a product of the respective editor's work more noticeably than editions of complete texts. Since the character of an edition affects the perception of the pieces, users need to understand the principles applied by editors, who are often influenced by the views current in the period in which the editions are made.

4 E.g. *Fragmenta poetarum veterum Latinorum, quorum opera non extant* by R. Stephanus and H. Stephanus (Estienne), Geneva 1564; *Q. Ennii poetae vetustissimi fragmenta, quae supersunt*, by H. Columna (Colonna), Naples 1590.

The main editions available today date from the late 19th until the present day and consist of the following: O. Ribbeck's edition of all comic and tragic Roman fragments (R. / Ri. / Ribb.), which went through three editions (1852 / 1871 / 1897, for the tragic fragments), with major changes in text and apparatus between the second (Ri.²) and first (Ri.¹) edition, which is hardly used any more, and less significant changes between the second (Ri.²) and third (Ri.³) edition, the third edition being a kind of *editio minor* with limited apparatus, brief preface and reduced indexes. These editions are supplemented by Ribbeck's monograph on Roman tragedy (*Die römische Tragödie*, 1875), where he does not provide a commentary in the strict sense, but offers his views on the interpretation of most fragments and particularly on the plot and possible models of all tragedies. A new version of Ribbeck's edition was started by A. Klotz (K. / Kl.), of which only the first volume, containing the tragedies, appeared (1953), and it is generally regarded as not going much beyond Ribbeck, even less informative in some respects. A new edition, replacing Ribbeck's edition of all tragic fragments, but presenting a more detailed apparatus on transmission and scholarship and often following different principles of establishing the text and ordering the fragments, *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta* (TrRF), is in progress; the first two volumes (Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Tragicci minores, Adespota and Ennius respectively) have already appeared (2012).

In addition to these editions providing the Latin text only, there are bilingual editions. Only the edition by E.H. Warmington (W. / W. / Warm.) in *Remains of Old Latin* in the Loeb series (1935 / 1936) covers all the tragic (and other poetic) fragments; it includes short introductions to each tragedy concerning the myth and possible plots, brief notes on the possible context of many fragments as well as English translations of all fragments and sometimes of the context, though, in line with the series, a rather brief critical apparatus. The French Budé series only has an edition of Accius' works by J. Dangel (D. / Da., 1995), and the Italian *Classici Latini* U.T.E.T. series has a first volume, which comprises the works of Livius Andronicus, Naevius and Ennius, by A. Traglia (T. / Tra., 1986). Independent of any series, individual tragic poets have received editions, translations and / or commentaries: Livius Andronicus: F. Spaltenstein 2008; Naevius: E.V. Marmorale 1950; F. Spaltenstein 2014; Ennius: J. Vahlen 1903 (2nd ed.); H.D. Jocelyn 1967; Pacuvius: G. D'Anna 1967; P. Schierl 2006; E. Artigas 2009 (fragments transmitted in Cicero already in Artigas 1990); Accius: V. D'Antò 1980; A. Pociña 1984; J. Dangel 1995.

All these editions differ in approach, coverage and layout; therefore for people engaging with Roman tragedy it is often necessary to consult several works before forming an opinion. The main issues to be considered by editors and users will be discussed in what follows, illustrated with significant exam-

ples. The case studies will mainly be taken from Ennius, with the editions of Ribbeck (mostly identical with Klotz), Vahlen, Warmington, Jocelyn and *TrRF* compared.⁵

3 Identification of Quotations

For the most straightforward form of a quotation from a Roman tragedy the transmitting author mentions the name of the tragic poet and the title of the tragedy and then proceeds to the quotation, signalled by the syntactical structure of the text and / or by the characteristic metre of the quoted line. However, this is not always the case. For instance, transmitting authors may integrate the quoted words into their own text. This problem is most acute with respect to literary writers who absorb quotations into their argument.

A good example is Cicero's reference to words of the god Apollo in Ennius:⁶

quid est enim praeclarius quam honoribus et rei publicae muneribus perfunctum senem posse suo iure dicere idem, quod apud Ennium dicat ille Pythius Apollo, se esse eum, unde sibi, si non populi et reges, at omnes sui cives consilium expetant, suarum⁷ rerum incerti; "quos ego mea ope ex | incertis certos compotesque consili | dimitto ut ne res temere tractent turbidas". est enim sine dubio domus iuris consulti totius oraculum civitatis.

For what is more glorious than that an old man, after having served in office and duties of the republic, is able to say, with full justification for him, the same thing that this Pythian Apollo says in Ennius, namely that he is the person from whom, if not nations and kings, but all his citizens seek counsel, uncertain of their affairs; "those I send away, turned by my help from unsure ones to sure ones and in control of their plans, so that they do not treat things in turmoil recklessly". For without doubt the house of a lawyer is the oracle of the entire community.

5 Almost all examples will be taken from Ennius' tragedies; full documentation for these textual examples can be found in *TrRF* 11. Discussion of problems of interpretation (with references) is provided in Jocelyn's commentary (1967). Introductions to Ennius and his tragedies are given in the relevant sections of Suerbaum (2002) and Boyle (2006).

6 Cic. *De or.* 1.199–200; Enn. *Trag.* 350–353 R³; 141–144 Va.²; 150–153 W.; 316–318 Joc.; 146 *TrRF*.

7 *suarum* vel *summarum* vel *suarum summarum*, codd.

The words signalled as a quotation by quotation marks in the text printed here are generally accepted as Ennian verses. However, there is some debate on whether the quotation from Ennius might start earlier. For, after Cicero has mentioned Ennius' *Pythius Apollo*, he clearly proceeds to reproducing what Apollo said in Ennius, but it is also clear from the start of the construction with *se esse eum* that Cicero's report begins in indirect speech and then changes to direct speech. The indirect speech obviously cannot be a verbatim quotation since an utterance by a character in a drama can only be direct; at the same time the report in indirect speech is likely to be inspired by Ennius' original words. Hence, editors have tried to turn this section into lines that scan: while Jocelyn and *TrRF* only have the lines indicated above (between the quotation marks) as Ennian verses, Vahlen and Warmington also accept *unde sibi populi et reges consilium expetunt | suarum rerum incerti*, and Ribbeck accepts *unde sibi populi et reges consilium expetunt | summarum rerum incerti* as Ennian (in addition to preferring different versions of the transmitted variants). Ennius' text is likely to have included something like the lines suggested by those editors; yet this portion has not been transmitted in this form and is based on reconstruction, without this being clearly signalled by the way in which the texts are printed in those editions. Therefore the most instructive solution would be to give only what is obviously metrical as a direct quotation from Ennius (with the surrounding text printed as prose), yet, in order to help the reader and not withhold likely inferences, to indicate in an apparatus or commentary that the preceding words are most likely based on Ennius and summarize options for restoring them.

Although in the case of grammatical and lexical writings, the boundaries are clearer due to the structure of those works, these texts have often been badly transmitted, and the state of the text therefore may raise questions about the limits of the quotations. For instance, the fourth-century lexicographer Nonius Marcellus illustrates forms and meanings of words by lists of examples, as in the following case from Ennius' *Andromacha*:⁸

rarenter . . . Ennius *Andromacha*:

"sed quasi aut ferrum aut lapis | durat rarenter gemitum † conatur trabem †".

<Pomponius> Ergastylo [Pomponius, *Atellana* 45 R.²]: . . .

8 Non. p. 515.24–32 Merc.; 829 Li.; Enn. *Trag.* 66–67 R³; 104 Va.²; 86–87 W.; 109–110 Joc.; 32 *TrRF*.

rarenter [“rarely”] . . . Ennius in *Andromacha*:

“but he / she endures as if a piece of iron or a rock, rarely does he / she make an attempt to utter a groan (?)”

<Pomponius> in *Ergastylus*: . . .

This is how the text of the fragment appears in Jocelyn and *TrRF* (Ribbeck and Vahlen emend to *conatur trahens*, and Warmington to *conatu trahens*). Since the end of the second line is corrupt and something may be missing, earlier editors have suggested a variety of readings: Iunius (1565) puts *conatur trabem ergastulo*, and Mercerus (1614) *conatur. Trabes Ergastulo*; in his annotations in the margin Iunius suggests *conatur. Pompon. Ergastulo*, and Bentinus (1526) says *trabem. <Pomponius> Ergastulo*. Because Nonius Marcellus quotes the line from Pomponius’ *Atellana* also elsewhere, where the text is less problematic (Non. p. 164.23–25 Merc.; 242 Li.; 186.1–3 Merc.; 273 Li.), it becomes possible to restore a section of the text in this passage and to clarify boundaries and attribution of words and lines as shown above.

Another problem consists of simple scribal errors, which, however, can lead to new words. This can be illustrated by an example from Ennius’ *Thyestes*:⁹

delectare, *inlicere*, *adtrahere*. Ennius *Thyeste*:

“set me Apollo ipse delectat, ductat Delphicus”

delectare [“to delight”; ante-class. also “to lure”] <means> “to entice”, “to draw”. Ennius in *Thyestes*:

“but the Delphian Apollo himself lures, draws me”

What is transmitted at the opening (with a little variation in spelling) is *thyestes et*. Warmington prints *et* as the first word of the fragment, whereas Ribbeck, Vahlen, Jocelyn and *TrRF* assume a common scribal error, slightly alter the word division and print *Thyeste: set*. This is the easiest correction of the ungrammatical *thyestes*. Yet it cannot be excluded that the *s* was added by someone who thought that the person’s name was *Thyestes* and no longer understood the construction, in which case *et* would be the correct reading. Here this alternative does not make a big difference for the understanding of the fragment, especially in the absence of a context, but it illustrates that even emendations that seem obvious might not restore the original text.

9 Non. p. 97.29–30 Merc.; 139 Li.; Enn. *Trag.* 295 R³; 361 Va.²; 353 W.; 303 Joc.; 136 *TrRF*.

4 Attribution of Quotations

Questions connected with the context are not limited to that of determining the start and endpoint of a quotation and the reading in those places, but also include the question of attribution. This arises when the transmitting author does not give both the name of the poet and the title of the tragedy. For instance, in the above example Cicero says that these are words of Apollo in Ennius; i.e., he gives the name of the poet and identifies the speaker, but he does not mention the title of the tragedy. Therefore, on the basis of the evidence provided by the transmitting text, some editors assign this fragment to Ennius' *incerta* (Ribbeck, Jocelyn, *TrRF*), while others try to offer guidance and assign it to the *Eumenides*, on the basis of what Apollo says and what is inferred about the plots of the various tragedies known for Ennius (Vahlen, Warmington). Again this suggestion is plausible; yet it might be more accurate to indicate such an attribution in an apparatus or commentary and leave the fragment with the *incerta*.

One of the most difficult cases of attribution is a well-known passage from Cicero's speech *Pro Sestio* (120–123): the overall content and structure of the passage, as well as variations in style make it clear that in this passage Cicero reports on dramatic performances of the famous actor Aesopus, including lines that he delivered:

quid fuit illud quod recenti nuntio de illo senatus consulto quod factum est in templo Virtutis ad ludos scaenamque perlato consessu maximo summus artifex et me hercule semper partium in re publica tam quam in scaena optimarum flens et recenti laetitia et mixto dolore ac desiderio mei egit apud populum Romanum multo gravioribus verbis meam causam quam egomet de me agere potuissem? summi enim poetae ingenium non solum arte sua, sed etiam dolore exprimebat. qua enim <vi>: "qui rem publicam certo animo adiuverit, | statuerit, steterit cum Achivis" – [Accius, *Trag.* 357–358 R³; 351–352 W.; Enn. *Trag.* 74–75 Joc.] vobiscum me stetisse dicebat, vestros ordines demonstrabat! revocabatur ab universis. "re dubia <... > | haut dubitarit vitam offerre nec capiti pepercerit" [Accius, *Trag.* 359–360 R³; 353–354 W.; Enn. *Trag.* 76–77 Joc.]. haec quantis ab illo clamoribus agebantur! [121] cum iam omisso gestu verbis poetae et studio actoris et exspectationi nostrae plauderetur: "summum amicum summo in bello –" nam illud ipse actor adiungebat amico animo et fortasse homines propter aliquod desiderium adprobabant: "summo ingenio praeditum". iam illa quanto cum gemitu populi Romani ab eodem paulo post in eadem fabula sunt acta! "o pater" –

[Enn. *Trag.* 81 R³; 92 Va.²; 101 W.; 87 Joc.; 23.10 *TrRF*] me, me ille absentem ut patrem deplorandum putabat, quem Q. Catulus, quem multi alii saepe in senatu patrem patriae nominarant. quanto cum fletu de illis nostris incendiis ac ruinis, cum patrem pulsum, patriam adflctam deploraret, domum incensam eversamque, sic egit ut demonstrata pristina fortuna cum se convertisset: “haec omnia vidi inflammari” [Enn. *Trag.* 86 R³; 97 Va.²; 106 W.; 92 Joc.; 23.15 *TrRF*] fletum etiam inimicis atque invidis excitaret! [122] pro di immortales! quid? illa quem ad modum dixit idem! quae mihi quidem ita et acta et scripta videntur esse ut vel a Q. Catulo, si revixisset, praeclare posse dici viderentur; is enim libere reprehendere et accusare populi non numquam temeritatem solebat aut errorem senatus: “o ingratifici Argivi, inmoenes Grai, inmemores benefici!” [Accius, *Trag.* 364 R³; 358 W.] non erat illud quidem verum; non enim ingrati, sed miseri, quibus reddere salutem a quo acceperant non liceret, nec unus in quemquam umquam gratior quam in me universi; sed tamen illud scripsit disertissimus poeta pro me, egit fortissimus actor, non solum optimus, de me, cum omnes ordines demonstraret, senatum, equites Romanos, universum populum Romanum accusaret: “exulare sinitis, sistis pelli, pulsum patimini” [Accius, *Trag.* 365 R³; 359 W.] quae tum significatio fuerit omnium, quae declaratio voluntatis ab universo populo Romano in causa hominis non popularis, equidem audiebam, existimare facilius possunt qui adfuerunt. [123] et quoniam huc me provexit oratio, histrio casum meum totiens conlacrimavit, cum ita dolenter ageret causam meam, ut vox eius illa praeclara lacrimis impediretur; neque poetae, quorum ego semper ingenia dilexi, tempori meo defuerunt; eaque populus Romanus non solum plausu sed etiam gemitu suo comprobavit. utrum igitur haec Aesopum potius pro me aut Accium dicere oportuit, si populus Romanus liber esset, an principes civitatis? nominatim sum appellatus in Bruto. “Tullius qui libertatem civibus stabiliverat” [Accius, *Praet.* 40 R³; 40 W.]. miliens revocatum est. parumne videbatur populus Romanus iudicare id a me et a senatu esse constitutum quod perditī cives sublatum per nos criminabantur?

Wasn't that what was achieved when—as soon as word of the senate's decree passed in the temple of Virtus was relayed to the theatre, at the games where a vast crowd was gathered—that supreme craftsman, who has (by Hercules!) ever played the best role in our commonwealth no less than on the stage, pled my case before the Roman people, with tears of fresh joy mixed with grief and longing for me, and with much weightier words than I could have done myself? He gave expression to the

foremost poet's talent not only through his craft but also through his grief: for when he forcefully delivered the lines on "the one who with mind resolved aided the commonwealth, set it upright, and stood with the Achaeans", he was saying that I stood with all of *you*, he was pointing at all the categories of the citizenry! Everyone called for a reprise—"when the going was uncertain he scarce balked to put his life at risk, unsparing of his fortunes". What a clamour greeted that performance! [121] The practised movements of the stage went by the boards, applause rained down for the poet's words, the actor's intensity, and the thought that I was going to return: "greatest friend amid the greatest war—" then in the spirit of friendship he added, and people approved, perhaps from some yearning they felt: "endowed with greatest talent". And what a groan arose from the Roman people when soon in the same play he delivered this phrase: "Oh father"—I, I in my absence should be mourned as a father, he thought—I whom Quintus Catulus and many others in the senate had called "father of the fatherland". What copious tears he shed in lamenting my fall in flames and ruin—the father expelled, his home set afire and razed to the ground, the fatherland beset—and what an effect he achieved: first gesturing toward my earlier good fortune, then whirling round to say, "All this I saw in flames!" he roused to weeping even those hostile to my person and envious of my success! [122] By the immortal gods! What a performance then followed! Every word, every gesture such that I think even Quintus Catulus, were he to come back to life, could speak the lines with distinction—for he was often accustomed freely to criticize and indict the people for rashness or the senate for folly: "Oh ungrateful Argives, thankless Greeks, unmindful of the favour done you!" Though that was not quite true: for those prevented from restoring well-being to the one from whom they had received it were not ungrateful but unhappy, nor was any individual ever more thankful to anyone than all the people together were to me. But still, the following line that the poet wrote, most eloquently, with reference to me, the actor—not just the best, but the bravest—delivered with reference to me, when he pointed to all the categories of the citizenry and indicted the senate, the equestrian order, the Roman people as a body: "You leave him in exile, you left him to be driven out, and now he's driven out you put up with it!" How they all joined then in a demonstration, how the Roman people as a body made plain its feelings for a man who is not "popular"—well, I for my part only heard the report, those who were present can more readily judge. [123] And since the course of my speech has carried me to this point, let me develop it a bit further. The actor wept over my misfortune time and

again, pleading my case with such deep feeling that that brilliant voice of his was stopped by tears; nor did the poet, whose talents I have ever esteemed, fail me in my hour of need; and the Roman people made plain their agreement not only with their applause but also with their groans. Tell me, then: should an Aesopus or an Accius have said all this on my behalf—were the Roman people truly free—or should the foremost men of our civil community? In the “Brutus” I was mentioned by name—“Tullius, who set freedom on a firm footing for the citizens”—and the line got countless encores. Did the Roman people seem uncertain that I and the senate had set in place what those desperadoes accused us of destroying? [trans. R.A. Kaster]

The last quotation in this passage comes from Accius’ Praetexta *Brutus*, and some of the other quotations must also derive from Accius according to what Cicero says (*Cicero Pro Sestio* 123). A scholion on this passage (*Scholia Bobiensia ad Ciceronem Pro Sestio* 120)¹⁰ notes that Cicero’s description refers to a performance of Accius’ *Eurysaces* and that in this performance the well-known actor Aesopus made the dramatic action comment on Cicero’s current situation, a practice also attested in other contexts for dramatic performances in Cicero’s time. However, it is also clear that the bits *o pater* and *haec omnia vidi inflammari* (*Cicero Pro Sestio* 121) come from Ennius’ *Andromacha*, since they are quoted elsewhere in the context of other lines, which clarifies the attribution to this tragedy.¹¹ This raises the question of the number of performances Cicero talks about and which plays the individual lines should be attributed to. Most scholars follow the scholiast and assume that this was a performance of Accius’ *Eurysaces* (and therefore attribute most of the lines to this play with the exception of those attested otherwise) and further suppose that the actor inserted lines from another play, Ennius’ *Andromacha*, along with lines invented by himself, into Accius’ *Eurysaces*.

However, Jocelyn has argued against this and attributed some lines usually ascribed to Accius’ *Eurysaces* to Ennius’ *Andromacha* (as indicated in the quotation above), assuming that the actor played two different roles in that

10 Schol. Bob. ad Cic. Sest. 120 (p. 136 St.): *summus artifex. actor illis temporibus notissimus tragicarum fabularum Aesopus egisse videtur Accii fabulam, quae scribitur Eurysaces, ita ut per omnem actionis cursum tempora rei p. significarentur et quodammodo Ciceronis fortuna deploraretur. ex quo illud probare contendit, omnes prorsus homines etiam infimae plebis restitutioni suae promptissime suffragatos.*

11 For *o pater* cf. Cic. *De or.* 3.102; 3.217; *Tusc.* 3.44; for *haec omnia vidi inflammari* cf. Cic. *De or.* 3.217; *Tusc.* 1.85; 3.45; 3.53.

play. The most recent commentator on Cicero's *Pro Sestio*, R.A. Kaster (2006), has rejected this reading and upheld the traditional interpretation.¹² Although in this case there is comparatively rich information about the plays from various sources, the issues of attribution and of the character of the performance remain intricate questions. Rather little is known about what was possible on the Roman stage in Cicero's time, there are no valid parallels, and Cicero is not a disinterested reporter (but the most extensive source for this period). The most straightforward interpretation, which does not assume much beyond what is said in the text, still seems to be to attribute all fragments to Accius' *Eurysaces* apart from those for which the provenance from Ennius' *Andromacha* is attested elsewhere.

Part of the problem derives from the fact that Cicero refers to a piece from Ennius' *Andromacha* that seems to have been famous in his time, a section often called the '*canticum* of Andromacha' in modern scholarship. It is assumed that it was well known because Cicero alludes to it frequently,¹³ and he often only quotes a few words and / or does not give the name of the poet and the title of the tragedy, but rather seems to expect his audience to know what he alludes to and not to require an indication of poet and play. Cicero's various quotations supplement each other since there is not too much divergence in the readings and the individual pieces seem to come from the same context. The sections quoted by Cicero consist of several passages of a few lines each, but as there is no testimonium that quotes them all, the order of the pieces is uncertain, and editors have suggested different versions, either organizing them according to the chronology of the transmitting texts or according to the presumed interpretation of how Andromacha's thoughts develop. Clearly, not only the identification of fragments, but also their order in a micro-context can present major problems.

12 Cf. Kaster 2006. 353: "But Jocelyn's objection is very weak: the traditional view is 'ludicrous' [Jocelyn's assessment] only if Aesopus is taken to have aimed at a verisimilar representation of a single character, which C.'s description of this *coup de théâtre* gives no reason to suppose. His solution, positing two separate plays in which Aesopus played three separate roles, is more awkward than the supposed difficulty it aims to remove."

13 Cf. Cic. *De or.* 3.102; 3.183; 3.217–218; *Orat.* 92–93; *Tusc.* 1.85; 1.105; 3.44–46; 3.53; also Non p. 181.1–2 Merc.; 265 Li.; Serv. et Serv. auct. ad Virg. *Aen.* 1.726; 2.241; Rufin. *Comp. et de metris orat.*, pp. 577.33–578.13 H.; *GL* VI, pp. 568.23–569.15 K.

5 Order and Arrangement of Fragments

The order of fragments is an issue also on a broader level. Once all fragments to be assigned to a particular tragedy have been collected, the question arises of how to arrange them. Jocelyn and *TrRF* follow an approach based on the information in the transmitting authors and order the fragments chronologically according to the dates of these writers and / or works (in case of fragments quoted by several authors, going by the earliest), thereby documenting transmission and reception and indicating when and by whom particular tragedies were known and mentioned. Most editors, however, try to recreate an outline of the actual tragedies and therefore organize the fragments according to what is thought to have been their original order in the plots. Such an order helps readers to establish an idea of the drama; in most cases, however, a possible order cannot be determined clearly and thus reflects the respective editor's opinion, which would ideally be distinguished from the evidence and presented separately in an apparatus or commentary.

Decisions on the plot and thus the order of the fragments tend to be based on the following considerations: titles of tragedies typically give the name of a mythical figure or figures, and on the basis of the appearance of these figures in other contexts in Greek and Roman literature, scholars form an idea of the myth behind the drama; this is then taken as the starting point for establishing the plot of the tragedy, in combination with any evidence offered by the fragments themselves and / or the quoting authors. The problem with such a procedure is that in most cases there are several versions of a myth and that the entire mythical biography of an individual offers more material than can be fitted into a single drama; this raises the question of which version and which section of a story have been chosen for a particular piece (except for rare cases when fragments and testimonia indicate it fairly clearly).

Further, because it is documented as the standard method that Roman tragedians follow Greek models, scholars typically look for suitable Greek tragedies: wherever there is a Greek tragedy of the same title that is extant in its entirety or in fragments and some overlap in plot or motifs can be discerned or inferred, this is taken as a starting point for the reconstruction of the plot of the Roman tragedy and thus the order of fragments. While this is a possible method in principle and can often be applied successfully, it is also clear that Latin poets sometimes chose less common versions of myths, changed the focus or modified details of myths. Therefore it is not a given that, if the title of a Roman play agrees with a Greek tragedy, the plot will as well; and in cases where a title is attested for several Greek tragedies by different playwrights,

Roman poets need not always have selected the most famous or most obvious one as a paradigm.

With respect to Ennius' *Andromacha* the situation is particularly complex, for, disregarding corruptions in the manuscripts, two versions of the title are transmitted: *Andromacha* (in various spellings) and *Andromacha aechmalotos* (or *-tis*). It used to be thought that these titles referred to two different plays about Andromacha (with some uncertainty about the reading of the second title) and that the epithet in the title ("captive") was intended to distinguish between the two. Scholars now assume that all fragments transmitted under either of those titles belong to a single tragedy and that the epithet, which may go back to the time of the composition of the tragedy or have been added later by grammarians, indicates the broad topic and atmosphere of the piece.

If one assumes that the title (or one of the titles) is *Andromacha* and then tries to establish the plot and a possible Greek model, one will immediately think of Euripides' piece of the same title. However, it has often been noted that the Ennian fragments also contain material that is reminiscent of Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Troades* and that the distinctive Ennian line *Andromachae nomen qui indidit, recte indidit* ("he who gave Andromache her name, give it correctly"),¹⁴ which must come from a tragedy about Andromacha (i.e. Ennius'), is compared by Varro, who transmits it (*Varro De lingua latina* 7.82), with Euripides, yet such a verse is not found in any of Euripides' extant tragedies. Either Varro's comparison is incorrect or Ennius has incorporated material from an unpreserved bit of Euripides or from a revised version of one of Euripides' tragedies circulating in Southern Italy. Therefore Ennius' play cannot be compared directly with any of the Euripidean tragedies in the form in which they are extant, in the sense that these would provide a direct model for the plot. Among the fragments several individual scenes, like Andromacha lamenting after the fall of Troy as seen above, can be discerned, but their order and respective role in the plot are difficult to determine precisely. The most objective place, therefore, to address the question of the order of the fragments in relation to possible plot structures seems to be an apparatus or a commentary, which allows the presentation of various options. For suggesting a plot by the order in which the fragments are arranged in an edition can only offer one version and may impose the editor's view upon readers.

Among Ennius' tragedies, comparison with Greek models is most promising for his *Medea*, since a sufficient number of lines have been preserved from this play, and some of them show a clear relationship to Euripides' *Medea* (though with distinctive variations). However, even here there is a problem: Ennian fragments belonging to the *Medea* story are transmitted under the titles *Medea*

14 Enn. *Trag.* 65 R³; 105 Va.²; 109 W.; 99 Joc.; 25 *TrRF*.

and *Medea exul*; and a fragment that apparently refers to someone being given a kind of tour of Athens has no place in a plot based on Euripides' *Medea*.¹⁵ Hence scholars either assume that there are two pieces on Medea, one based on Euripides' *Medea* and the other set at a later stage in the heroine's career, or that Ennius' *Medea* covers a longer period than Euripides' *Medea* and includes a sequel in Athens. In either case Euripides' *Medea* is a rough guide, but cannot be completely relied on for establishing the entire plot of Ennius' *Medea*.

This view about plot has further repercussions since there exist a number of dramatic fragments without identification of poet or play that seem to come from tragedies on Medea. On the basis of assumptions about the plot, some unattributed fragments have been assigned to Ennius' *Medea* by some editors and printed with the fragments securely attested for this tragedy.¹⁶ Clearly, an edition has to indicate the possibility that there might be more extant fragments for any given tragedy than those that are explicitly attributed to it in the transmission. An editor's intention, however, to reduce the number of unattributed lines and to combine these with the fragments securely attested for a play without any signal might be confusing and convey the impression to readers that there is more certain evidence than there actually is.

6 Reconstruction and Its Limits

Reconstruction of plots after Greek models as well as the order and attribution of fragments based on such assumptions may be problematic as a guiding principle for arranging material in an edition. There are further issues related to limited evidence that may not necessarily have repercussions for the presentation of the text, but that are rather relevant for providing details in an apparatus or a commentary.

From Ennius' *Athamas* a single fragment has been preserved:¹⁷

euhoe . . . Ennius in Athamante: "<h>is erat in ore Bromius, his Bacchus pater, | illis Lyaeus vitis inventor sacrae. | tum pariter † euhan euhium † | ignotus iuvenum coetus alterna vice | inibat alacris Bacchico insulta<n>s modo.

15 Cf. Varro, *Ling.* 7.9; Non. pp. 469.34–470.6 Merc.; 753 Li.; Enn. *Trag.* 242–243 R³; 287–288 Va.²; 294–295 W.; 239–240 Joc.; 94 *TrRF*: *asta atque Athenas anticum opulentum oppidum | contempla et templum Cereris ad laevam aspice.*

16 Cf. Enn. *Trag.* 224–225, 226–227, 228–230, 231–232, *Trag. inc.* 156/157, 172–173 R³.

17 Char. *GL* I, p. 241.3–11 K.; p. 314 Bar.; Enn. *Trag.* 107–111 R³; 123–127 Va.²; 128–132 W.; 120–124 Joc.; 42 *TrRF*.

“*euhoē*” [i.e. a cry of Bacchantes] ... Ennius in *Athamas*: “In their mouth was Bromius, in theirs father Bacchus, in others Lyaeus, the inventor of the sacred vine. Then shouting “*euhoē*” (?) in the same manner, in alternation, an unknown group of young men entered briskly, dancing in Bacchic manner.”

Starting from this fragment, Ribbeck, in his accompanying book (1875: 204–205), assumes that this description of a Bacchic troop points towards Euripides’ *Ino*. After summarizing the plot on the basis of Hyginus (*Fabulae* 4), he says that in the middle of this Bacchic troop, which was celebrating orgies on Mount Parnassus, Ino was recognized, and that the verses come from a messenger speech reporting this incident. After a few comments on the metre, he ends by adding that the plot of Ennius’ *Athamas* could also have been the same as the one he suggested for Livius Andronicus’ *Ino* (another section of the *Athamas* myth). This reveals that the assumption of a specific context for the transmitted fragment is uncertain. In fact, the text of the fragment shows that it describes Bacchic celebrations, and a messenger speech is likely since the celebrants are referred to in the third person. The context assumed by Ribbeck is plausible in a piece on *Athamas*, but, as he himself reveals, not certain. Therefore such an explanation of the fragments can only be offered as an interpretation or hypothesis.

7 Readings

On a smaller scale, the reading of single lines may present problems. If there are difficulties with the metre or the grammar, it will be obvious that these need to be indicated and / or editorial intervention is called for. Often, however, the establishment of the text is not only based on textual, metrical or linguistic criteria, but involves interpretation when one has to choose between different readings or to decide whether passages quoted in different contexts might belong together.

The last problem is demonstrated by the following example: Varro quotes tragic verses illustrating the use of the word *templum*, including a piece from *Andromacha* (Varro *De lingua latina* 7.6):¹⁸

templum tribus modis dicitur: ab natura, ab auspicando, a similitudine; ...
sub terra, ut in *Andromacha*: “*Acherusia templa alta Orci salvete infera*”

18 Enn. *Trag.* 70–72 R³; 107–110 Va.²; 113–116 W.; 98 Joc.; 24 *TrRF*.

The word *templum* [“sacred area”, “temple”] is used in three ways: with regard to nature, to taking the auspices, to similarity;... beneath the earth, as in *Andromacha*: “deep Acherusian, sacred underworld areas of Orcus, be greeted”

Cicero cites the following lines (*Cicero Tusculanae disputationes* 1.48):

quae est anus tam delira quae timeat ista, quae vos videlicet, si physica non didicissetis, timeretis, “Acherusia templa alta Orci, ... pallida leto, nubila tenebris loca”? non pudet philosophum in eo gloriari, quod haec non timeat et quod falsa esse cognoverit?

What old woman is so crazy that she is afraid of what you would be afraid of if you had not studied natural philosophy, “deep Acherusian, sacred areas of Orcus, ... pale with death, places dim with darkness”? Should a philosopher not be ashamed of boasting of the fact that he does not fear such things and that he has realized that they are false?

The quotations by the two writers share the four words *Acherusia templa alta Orci*; Varro’s quotation is explicitly attributed to a drama entitled *Andromacha* (and only Ennius’ *Andromacha* is known from the period before Varro), but Cicero’s text does not include an indication of the poet or the play. Because of the shared wording many editors have assumed that these bits refer to the same passage and that words have been omitted by both authors, leading to various reconstructions:

Acherunsia templa alta Orci, | pallida leto, nubila tenebris, | loca salvete infera <...> (R²)

Acherunsia templa alta Orci, | pallida leto, nubila tenebris loca, salvete, infera <noctis>! (R²)

Acherusia templa alta Orci | salvete infera | pallida leti nubila tenebris | loca (Va.², W.).

Jocelyn and *TrRF* do not combine the two, and Jocelyn (*ad loc.*) points out that the shared phrase is not particularly distinctive and it is hard to see why words should have been left out in that way; he therefore recommends keeping the two pieces (quoted by Varro and Cicero respectively) separate and assigning the second to the *incerta*. This seems to be the safest decision, which does not

presuppose anything or rewrite the text; still, the similarity in phrasing can be pointed out in an apparatus or commentary.

A problem of choosing between different readings poses itself in connection with the following Ennian fragment, which some have attributed to *Erectheus*:¹⁹

occumbere morti novae locutionis figura et penitus remota. Ennius “ut vos nostri liberi | defendant, pro vostra vita morti occumbant obviam”

occumbere morti [“to meet death”]. A form of a novel expression and far removed <from ordinary usage>. Ennius: “that our sons defend you, meet death for the sake of your life”

In the first line of the fragment the manuscript (C) has *nostri* and a corrected version (C²) has *vestri*; in combination with possible adaptations of the other pronouns in these verses this has led to a number of versions: Ribbeck chooses *vos vostri* | ... *vostra*; Vahlen² and Warmington have *nos vostri* | ... *nostra*, and Jocelyn and *TrRF* opt for *vos nostri* | ... *vostra*. While Vahlen and Warmington introduce a conjecture, which is problematic as the context is not known and the transmitted text can be construed to make sense, Ribbeck chooses one of the transmitted versions, which yields a plausible sense: someone says to a group of people that their children defend them and die for them. Jocelyn and *TrRF* choose another transmitted version, which gives a slightly unexpected sense: someone says that their own children defend and die for others. Situations where this could be said might be envisaged, and because this is a less obvious statement, this could be regarded as the *lectio difficilior*, with the manuscript having been corrected to produce a more straightforward version. Therefore the more perplexing reading might be preferable, but a definite decision is difficult, and only an apparatus or commentary can reveal the full complexity of the issue.

Elsewhere decisions have to be made between two versions preserved in different authors. For the last word of the following fragment Gellius (*Noctes atticae* 4.17.14) transmits *strepitu* and Festus (p. 394.33–37 Li.) *spiritu*:²⁰

per ego deum sublimas subices | umidas, unde oritur imber sonitu saevo et spiritu

19 Serv. auct. Verg. *Aen.* 2.62; Enn. *Trag.* 383–384 R³; 135–136 Va.²; 140–141 W.; 397–398 Joc.; 198 *TrRF*.

20 Enn. *Trag.* 2–3 R³; 10–11 Va.²; 16–17 W.; 3–4 Joc.; 2 *TrRF*.

I, by the liquid underlayers of the gods high up [i.e. clouds], from where the rain comes with fierce sound and wind, <swear / pray>

Since both versions are equally well attested,²¹ scan and are grammatical, only the sense and the conventions of the language in the respective case and parallel instances can decide (with *spiritu* generally preferred, being regarded as more appropriate in a description of the sounds of rain and in view of the collocation with *sonitu*).

8 Orthography and Punctuation

Fragments are typically transmitted in the spelling common at the time of the transmitting authors (besides being possibly affected by the conventions of medieval scribes). As the early Roman tragic poets were active at a time when the language used was what is called ‘Archaic Latin’, the question arises whether in establishing the fragmentary texts one should keep what the manuscripts offer or try to reconstruct a reflection of an earlier state of the language.

Sometimes the metre of cited verses or testimonia in later authors reveal details about the linguistic usage of tragic poets, as shown by the following comment in Cicero:²²

“Burrum” semper Ennius, nunquam “Pyrrhum”; “vi patefecerunt Bruges”,²³ non “Phryges”. ipsius antiqui declarant libri. nec enim Graecam litteram adhibebant – nunc autem etiam duas – et cum “Phrygum” et “Phrygibus” dicendum esset, absurdum erat aut <e>t<i>am in barbaris casibus Graecam litteram adhibere aut recto casu solum Graece loqui; tamen et “Phryges” et “Pyrrhum” aurium causa dicimus.

Ennius always <uses the form> “Burrus”, never “Pyrrhus”; “the Bruges opened up by force”, not “Phryges”. The old books of <the poet> himself demonstrate it. For they were not used to have recourse to a Greek letter [i.e. *y*]—but now even to two [i.e. *y* and *z*]—and when “Phrygum” and “Phrygibus” [i.e. “Phryges” in genitive and dative / ablative] were to be said, it was absurd either in the oblique cases too to have recourse to a

21 A similar alternative transmission exists for a fragment of Accius (*Trag.* 392 R³; 382 W.): *ingenti sonitu et spiritu* (*spiritu* in Prisc. *GL* III, p. 424.13 K.; *strepitu* in Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.89).

22 Cic. *Orat.* 160; Enn. *Trag.* 332 R³; 176 Va.²; 183 W.; 334 Joc.; 154 *TrRF*.

23 Transmitted: *fruges* : *phruges* : *friges* : *phry* : *briges*.

Greek letter or to speak Greek in the nominative only; still we say both “*Phryges*” [nominative / accusative] and “*Pyrrhum*” [accusative] for the sake of our ears.

In other cases, however, peculiarities of the language can only be inferred. Hence it may be a more accurate reflection of what has been preserved if the orthography of the later authors is kept rather than making attempts at reconstruction. Details of linguistic forms might therefore be discussed more usefully in an introduction or commentary.

As regards punctuation (or establishing metrical units), there is obviously no indication in the manuscripts, and such choices depend on an editor’s decisions; this is an area where decisions need to be made in order to establish a printable text.

An example of how the interpretation of the text can change depending on the punctuation is provided by the following piece from Ennius’ *Hectoris lytra*:²⁴

derepente... Ennius Hectoris ly{s}tris: “ecce autem caligo oborta est, omnem prospectum abstulit | derepente; contulit sese in pedes”

derepente [“suddenly”; mainly ante- and post-class.]... Ennius in *Hectoris lytra*: “but, look, darkness has arisen, it has taken away the entire view suddenly; he took to his heels”

Klotz, Warmington and Jocelyn punctuate after *abstulit*, Ribbeck and Warmington indicate a lacuna in this spot. But as the undisputed first half of the first line indicates, the observation in this fragment takes its starting point from a darkness suddenly arising. Therefore it seems most logical that the second half of this line (including the beginning of the second line) goes on to describe the sudden effect of this development, followed by a reaction of a person. Since enjambment occurs in Ennius elsewhere (even allowing for different metrical arrangements of lines),²⁵ the punctuation suggested above allows the interpretation of a transmitted text in a way that makes good sense without any further changes.

24 Non. p. 518.3–26 Merc.; pp. 833–834 Li.; Enn. *Trag.* 146–147 R³; 182–183 Va.²; 194–195 W.; 167–168 Joc.; 71 *TrRF*.

25 Cf. e.g. Enn. *Trag.* 34–35, 57–59, 73, 177–180, 39–56 R³; 47–48, 72–75, 83–84, 215–218, 54–71 Va.²; 50–51, 76–79, 88–89, 222–225, 57–75 W.; 62–63, 69–71, 106–107, 188–191, 32–49 Joc.; 15, 21, 30, 83, 151 *TrRF*.

9 Conclusions: Problems and Approaches

As the preceding rapid overview will have indicated, both producers and users of editions of fragmentary texts are faced with a variety of challenges. Whatever the responses are, scholars need to be aware of the problems and the possible solutions, in order to assess the material presented and to distinguish between actual evidence and more or less plausible hypotheses.

The issues to be addressed cover both individual lines and the arrangement of material in an edition as a whole. They include decisions on readings of particular words, punctuation and metrical units, the identification of fragments, their attribution to particular poets and / or plays, the arrangement and ordering of these pieces and the relevance of the context. In some cases editors may find ways of opting out of committing themselves, but in most instances decisions have to be made in order to enable the production of an edition. Whatever decision is taken (frequently there is no 'right' answer), it seems most important that the principles are clarified and, wherever possible, editorial interventions are signalled, so that readers can distinguish between transmitted material and an editor's work, which tends to be based on their interpretation.

The extreme positions are, on the one hand, the attempt to present as clear and readable a text as possible (e.g. introducing conjectures to produce comprehensible lines, assigning unattributed lines to specific tragedies and ordering them in a way that they recreate a plot) and, on the other hand, the intention to leave the transmitted material untouched as far as possible and present an 'objective' record of what is extant (e.g. limiting the use of conjectures and placing cruces instead where the text has obvious metrical or grammatical problems, assigning to the *incerta* everything that does not come with a clear indication of poet and play and presenting fragments chronologically according to the dates of the transmitting authors).

Both methods have their advantages and disadvantages, since there is something to be said for not interfering with the tradition in the face of so much uncertainty, as in the area of fragments even stating what can and cannot be known is a step forward; yet equally there is benefit in providing expert help to readers. Ideally, an edition would do both, while clearly distinguishing between the two; this means that such an edition would need to be accompanied by an introduction, translation, apparatus and / or commentary, where the rationale behind the textual decisions can be explained and further information beyond the mere text can be given.

Since editions are prepared with different goals and different types of readers in mind, different formats can be appropriate in individual cases. If readers realize this and understand to what extent the edition or editions used affect their view of fragmentary texts, a great deal will be achieved.

The Argo Killed Hippolytus: Roman Tragedy in the (Meta-)Theatre

Mario Erasmo

Hooper: “This was no boat accident.”
(*Jaws*, 1975)

The highly allusive description of Hippolytus’ death in Seneca’s *Phaedra* draws comparisons to epic. Coffey and Mayer go further and see the piecing together of Hippolytus’ body parts as a metaphor for the writing process:

Just below the surface of Seneca’s text, with the attempt to recompose mutilated fragments of a once beautiful form, lies Seneca’s own authorial problem: recomposing into a beautiful unity the now scattered pieces of a past tradition: the two Hippolytus plays of Euripides, possibly the *Aegeus*, the finale of the *Bacchae*, Sophocles’ *Phaedra*, even Ovid’s Fourth *Heroides*, and the seventh book of the *Metamorphoses*. The self-conscious blending of two separate plays of Euripides at this point, *Hippolytus* and *Bacchae*, gives the issue an immediate grounding in the text.¹

An impressive number of Greek tragic and Latin poetic intertexts are identified from the point of view of writing but what about the effect of intertextuality on viewing the play?² I examine this scene for its potential in eliciting intertextual

1 Coffey and Mayer (1990: 180) on Sen. *Phaedra* 1035–1049: “The description is self-indulgently long and belongs rather to the epic tradition.” Compare Charles Segal (1986: 215): “The last scene of the *Phaedra* has a peculiarly complex form of literariness and textuality, for Seneca here ‘contaminates’ Euripides’ *Hippolytus* with the *Bacchae*.”

2 Cf. Segal (1984: 311–325) for the effect of intertextuality on performance reception, in particular 312: “His description of the death of Hippolytus in the *Phaedra*, the chief concern of this essay, is half again as long as Euripides (114 verses to 76). This expansiveness is probably an indication of an author composing at least as much for readers or hearers of recitations as for spectators in the theater.” Whether one believes that the plays were performed or are performable, as Harrison (2000: 137–138) notes on the performance of Seneca’s plays: “First things first: every play is produced and receives full staging if only in the mind’s eye of the poet.” Cf. also Littlewood (2004: 172): “Senecan tragedy is written as drama. Whether or not the plays were staged they have the literary form of theatrical events.” The same conclusion is reached most recently by Kohn (2013: 140): “First and foremost, it should now be clear

allusions to even more intertexts on and off the stage and potential audience/reader reactions to them. Through the associative viewing/reading process with previous plays, poetic intertexts, and spectacle entertainment, the scene produces the unexpected intertextual outcome of the Argo killed Hippolytus. The complex intertextuality of the narrative goes further however, and serves a metatheatrical purpose that situates the play in the figurative space of (meta-) theatre.

In Seneca's *Phaedra*, Theseus believing that his son Hippolytus attempted to seduce his wife Phaedra, calls upon his father Neptune to punish him. Theseus' wish is fulfilled as Hippolytus rides his chariot along the shore and a threatening sea-monster/bull appears and frightens his horses. Hippolytus, thrown from the chariot, gets caught in the reins and his body is mangled as the horses flee. Events are described in a lengthy messenger speech (1000–1114) that begins with a description of the turmoil at sea (1007–1034):

cum subito vastum tonuit ex alto mare
 crevitque in astra. nullus inspirat salo
 ventus, quieti nulla pars caeli strepit
 placidumque pelagus propria tempestas agit. 1010
 non tantus Auster Sicula disturbat freta
 nec tam furens Ionis exsurgit sinus
 regnante Coro, saxa cum fluctu tremunt
 et cana summum spuma Leucaten ferit.
 consurgit ingens pontus in vastum aggerem, 1015
 [tumidumque monstro pelagus in terras ruit]
 nec ista ratibus tanta construitur lues:
 terris minatur; fluctus haud cursu levi
 provolvitur; nescioquid onerato sinu
 gravis unda portat. quae novum tellus caput 1020
 ostendet astris? Cyclas exoritur nova?
 latuere rupes numine Epidauri dei
 et scelere petrae nobiles Scironides
 et quae duobus terra comprimitur fretis.
 Haec dum stupentes sequimur, en totum mare 1025
 immugit, omnes undique scopuli adstrepunt;

that Seneca was, in fact, a dramaturge in the truest sense of the word: a maker of dramas. Regardless of whether he composed with an actual theater or a fictive stage in mind, the Roman playwright constructed his tragedies with a certain consistency. A careful reading of the plays reveals entrances and exits, gestures, properties, and the emotions of the characters."

summum cacumen rorat expulso sale,
 pumat vomitque vicibus alternis aquas
 qualis per alta vehitur Oceani freta
 fluctum refundens ore physeter capax. 1030
 inhorruit concussus undarum globus
 solvitque sese et litori envexit malum
 maius timore, pontus in terras ruit
 suumque monstrum sequitur—os quassat tremor.³

Then suddenly the sea thundered mightily from its depths and swelled towards the stars. No wind was sweeping the saltwater, and the sky was peaceful, nowhere in uproar: the sea's calm was stirred by a storm all its own. Not so powerfully does the south wind disturb the Straits of Sicily, nor so madly does the Ionic Gulf well up beneath a tyrannous north-wester, when rocks shudder under waves, and white foam strikes Leucate's summit. The vast sea rises into a huge mound; it hides the cliffs fanned for the power of the Epidaurian god, and the rocks famed for Sciron's crimes, and the land hemmed in by two gulfs. Yet this towering cataclysm is not for ships—it threatens the land: the wave rolls forward apace, a heavy surge bearing something in its burdened womb. What land will show its new face to the stars? Is some Cycladic island rising? While we ask such questions in amazement, behold the whole sea bellows, and all the surrounding cliffs roar back swelling with a monster, the flood rushes towards the land. Its crest showers a fountain of brine, it foams and spews out water at intervals, just as a whale, journeying through Ocean's deeps, pours out of its mouth the stream it has swallowed. The ball of water shakes, trembles, breaks open, and brings to shore an evil that outdoes fear; the sea rushes onto the land, chasing its own monster. My lips tremble with fear.

The cause of the turmoil at sea is not immediately identified as the bull, the animal associated with Neptune, but the turmoil itself is threatening and poses a danger even before the bull is identified as the actual danger (1036). The disturbance at sea becomes a spectacle within the play that engrosses the attention of the spectators (*Haec dum stupentes sequimur*, 1025) including the audience/reader who is guided and manipulated in their understanding of the scene until all of the facts are given. The sea reacts first (1015) to the

3 This and subsequent quotations from the *Phaedra* are from the OCT text of Otto Zwierlein (1988), *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae*. All translations of the *Phaedra* are from the Loeb Classical Library edition of Seneca's Tragedies by John G. Fitch (2002).

bull's violent entrance before its own appearance undergoes various transformations in the evolving description used to describe it: a plain (*aggerem*, 1015) that is personified as a bull (*immugit*, 1026) takes on the characteristics of a volcano as the water gushes and spews (1027–1028). The changing appearances of the sea elicit varying similes including a whale (1030) and a monster born from the sea (*pontus in terras ruit / suum monstrum sequitur / os quassat tremor*, 1033–1034) that reaches the shore first and gives birth to the sea creature in the form of a bull (*taurus*, 1036) that is identified as the messenger speech continues (1035–1049):⁴

Quis habitus ille corporis vasti fuit!	1035
caerulea taurus colla sublimis gerens	
erexit altam fronte viridanti iubam;	
stant hispidae aures, orbibus varius color,	
et quem feri dominator habuisset gregis	
et quem sub undis natus: hinc flammam vomunt	1040
oculi, hinc relucet caerulea insignes nota;	
opima cervix arduos tollit toros	
naresque hiulcis haustibus patulae fremunt;	
musco tenaci pectus ac palear viret,	
longum rubenti spargitur fuco latus;	1045
tum pone tergus ultima in monstrum coit	
facies et ingens belua immensam trahit	
squamosa partem. talis extremo mari	
pistrix citatas sorbet aut frangit rates.	

What an impression was given by that vast body! A bull, carrying high its dark-blue neck, with a tall crest rising above its greenish brow; ears erect and shaggy; eyes of varying colour, both such as the overlord of a wild herd might have, and such as a seaborne creature: in part the eyes spew flame, in part they gleam with a striking sea-blue quality. The neck full, raising its muscles aloft; the nostrils broad and distended, snorting as he breathes. Chest and dewlap are green with changing moss, the long flanks daubed with red seaweed. Then the hindparts merge into a monstrous shape—a huge creature trailing an immense scaly appendage. Such is the leviathon in remote seas that swallows or smashes boats under sail.

4 Boyle (1987: 198) and Furley (1992: 562–566) for the image of the sea giving birth to the bull as unique to Seneca that also recalls the birth of the Minotaur.

The emphasis of the description is on the head and menacing facial features that are the colour of the sea (*caerulea*... *colla*, 1036) and covered in green moss (1044) and red seaweed (1045) then on the body that is snake-like (1047–1048) as though it were coming into view from front to back. The bull is also compared to a whale/sea monster (*belua*, 1047; *pistrix*, 1049) that destroys ships (1049) so its appearance defies immediate and certain identification.

The initial point of contact for the description of Hippolytus' death is Euripides' extant *Hippolytus* (1173–1254) in which a bull emerges from the sea (1213–1214) and causes Hippolytus to lose control of his chariot and become entangled in the reins but he does not die immediately (1215–1248).⁵ The emphasis after two initial similes (at 1201 and 1221) that describe its appearance is not on the entrance of the bull that receives only two lines (αὐτῷ δὲ σὺν κλύδωνι καὶ τρικυμίᾳ/ κῦμ' ἐξέβηκε ταῦρον, ἄγριον τέρας, 1213–1214), nor on the impact of its entry into the consciousness or dramatic/epic space of Hippolytus or the messenger. The focus, rather, is on the punishment and imminent death of Hippolytus that leads to the reconciliation between father and son that is absent in Seneca's version.

Seneca's description of the sea-monster/ bull is a "fusion of contrasting forms, colors, and masses"⁶ but it is also an intertextual creature that is influenced by Ovid's own version of Hippolytus' death in the *Metamorphoses* (15.506–529)⁷ that begins with a description of the sea-monster (15. 506–513):⁸

Pittheam profugo curru Troezena petebam
iamque Corinthiaci carpebam litora ponti,
cum mare surrexit, cumulusque inmanis aquarum
in montis speciem curvari et crescere visus

5 Cf. Segal (1984) for an extended discussion of the intertextuality of the scenes in Seneca and Euripides. The original version of Euripides' play, the *Hippolytos Kalyptomenos* only survives in fragments and descriptions.

6 Segal (1984: 319).

7 On the influence of Vergilian and Ovidian epic on Senecan tragedy, cf. Coffey and Mayer (1990: 181–183). The observation receives fuller attention in Mayer (2002: 69–70): "*Phaedra* is a drama but it is also, and perhaps in Seneca's case primarily, a poetic text. Just as the dramatic action is owed to a remix of Greek tragedies, so the verbal texture is heavily indebted to recycling phraseology from the works of the Augustan giants, Virgil, Horace (particularly in the choral lyrics of the play), and above all, Ovid." Cf. Segal (1984: 320–321) for an extended discussion on Seneca's debt to Vergil.

8 This and subsequent citations and translations of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* come from the Loeb Classical Library edition of Frank Justus Miller (1984).

et dare mugitus summoque cacumine findi; 510
corniger hinc taurus ruptis expellitur undis
pectoribus tenus molles erectus in auras
naribus et patulo partem maris evomit ore.

Banished from home, I was making for Troezen, Pittheus' city, in my chariot, and now was coursing along the beach of the Corinthian bay, when the sea rose up and a huge mound of water seemed to swell and grow to mountain size, to give forth bellowings, and to be cleft at its highest point. Then the waves burst and a horned bull was cast forth, and, raised from the sea breast-high into the yielding air, he spouted out great quantities of water from his nostrils and wide mouth.

The description of the disturbance at sea as a *cumulusque inmanis aquarum* (*Metamorphoses* 15.508) inspired Seneca's *aggerem* (*Phaedra* 1015) and *illa moles* (*Phaedra* 1059) that anticipate through sound (*dare mugitus*, *Metamorphoses* 15.510) the bull that the disturbance produces. Seneca's sea-monster shares similarities with Ovid's other description of a sea-monster in the *Metamorphoses*, Cetus that threatened Andromeda and was killed by Perseus: [...] *unda/ insonuit, veniensque inmenso belua ponto/ inminet et latum sub pectore possidet aequor* (4.688–690). Cetus, first identified as a sea monster (*belua*), is then compared to a boat: *Ecce, velut navis praefixo concita rostro/ sulcat aquas iuvenum sudantibus acta lacertis,/ sic fera dimotis impulsu pectoris undis* (4.706–708).

Both of these descriptions in Ovid, in turn, derive from Accius' description of the Argo in the *Medea sive Argonautae*, possibly adapted from a lost original by Sophocles.⁹ In Accius' play, the cause of the turmoil at sea is unknown as the shepherd struggles to describe the previously unseen creature, that is, the Argo, in words that describe natural phenomena that he has seen before (381–396):¹⁰

Tanta moles labitur
fremibunda ex alto ingenti sonitu et spiritu;
prae se undas volvit, vortices vi suscitāt;
ruit prolapsa, pelagus respergit reflat.

9 For the influence of Accius on the plays of Seneca, cf. Curley (2013: 26–27).

10 Cited is the Loeb Classical Library text and translation of E.H. Warmington (1982) *Remains of Old Latin*, Volume 2.

guine fluctus/ ore vomit (*Metamorphoses* 4.728–729).¹¹ But in his version of the Hippolytus myth, Ovid reverts to Accius' order of the Argo's description and evolution from something unknown to known.

Seneca exploits Ovid's descriptions of the sea-monster/ bull and of Cetus that had integrated Accius' description of the Argo in the *Medea sive Argonautae*. Seneca's engagement with Accius' text, however, in the way that the sea-monster/ bull moves through the water suggests direct contact for a fusion of tragic and epic intertexts including Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Seneca does not dramatize episodes in Ovid as much as he exploits the dramatic potential of Ovid's own theatricalized narrative that he fuses with the texts of other authors as he does here with Accius.¹² Seneca's *aggerem* (1015) and *moles* (1059) echo Accius' description of the Argo but Ovid's description of the bull as *cumulusque inmanis aquarum* (*Metamorphoses* 15.508–510) also alludes to Accius' text (*globosos turbines* at 387 and recalls Seneca's *undarum globus*, 1031). The effect of the ambiguous or redirected language is to subsume the identity of the Argo into the category of monster. The Argo startles the shepherd who describes what he sees as he sees it but it is not perceived as a threat to himself in the extant text. It will pose a danger for Medea in the form of Jason on board the ship (as a ship would for Dido when the ship carrying Aeneas arrives in Carthage).

In Seneca, the messenger relates the events and the reactions to them including those of a shepherd who flees in terror (1007–1008) in a nod to the shepherd in Accius' text. The danger, however, is to Hippolytus as a consequence of his rejection of Phaedra's sexual advances and Theseus' reaction to Phaedra's deception about them. The allusion in Seneca of the yet to be identified monster as a bull recalls the myths of Europa's abduction by a bull at sea (Zeus) and of Andromeda threatened by a sea monster (Cetus) sent by Poseidon but also metaphors that reverse the gender threat and equate women with the dangers of the sea in Alcaeus (fragments 73.208), Semonides (7), and Horace

11 Ennius' description of Cetus' dismemberment in the *Andromeda* (7.105–106 R³): *alia fluctus differt dissipat/ visceratim membra, maria salso spumant sanguine*. This may be the source of Accius' description of the Argo and Ovid's description of Cetus/Argo. For a discussion of the Ennian fragment, cf. M. Filippi (2011: 164).

12 The narrative/dramatic technique of engaging with Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is evident elsewhere including Seneca's *Troades* 799–812, in which Andromache performs funerary rites for Hector (through Astyanax) in front of Hector's tomb in imitation of Ovid's Hecuba performing the same rites at Hector's tomb in the *Metamorphoses* 13.425–28. On theatre in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, cf. Gildenhard, Ingo and Zissos (1999: 162–181). For Ovid's "tragedy" of Hecuba, cf. Erasmo (2008: 92–100).

(*Odes* 1.5, 1.14, 1.27 and 1.33), including Venus whose birth and arrival from the sea was accompanied by foam.¹³

The extended description of the reaction to the bull shifts character/audience attention to the shore (1050–1084):

Tremuere terrae, fugit attonitum pecus	1050
passim per agros, nec suos pastor sequi	
meminit iuencos; omnis e saltu fera	
diffugit, omnis frigido esanguis metu	
venator horret. solus immunis metu	
Hippolytus artis continet frenis equos	1055
pavidosque notae vocis hortatu ciet.	
Est alta ad Argos collibus ruptis via,	
vicina tangens spatia suppositi maris;	
hic se illa moles acuit atque iras parat.	
ut cepit animos seque praetemptans satis	1060
prolusit irae, praepeti cursu euolat,	
summam citato vix gradu tangens humum,	
et torva currus ante trepidantis stetit.	
contra feroci gnatus insurgens minax	
vultu nec ora mutat et magnum intonat:	1065
‘haud frangit animum vanus hic terror meum:	
nam mihi paternus vincere est tauros labor.’	
[...]	
Inobsequentes protinus frenis equi	
rapuere cursum iamque derrantes via,	
quacumque rabidos pavidus evexit furor,	1070
hac ire pergunt seque per scopulos agunt.	
at ille, qualis turbido rector mari	
ratem retentat, ne det obliquum latus,	
et arte fluctum fallit, haud aliter citos	
currus gubernat: ora nunc pressis trahit	1075
constricta frenis, terga nunc torto frequens	
verbere coercet. sequitur adisduus comes,	
nunc aequa carpens spatia, nunc contra obuius	
oberrat, omni parte terrorem movens.	
non licuit ultra fugere: nam toto obuius	1080
incurrit ore corniger ponti horridus.	

13 Seneca also uses Greek lyric intertexts that equate women with sexual danger in the *Thyestes* when the pool of water torments Tantalus. Cf. Erasmo (2006: 185–198).

tum vero pavida sonipedes mente exciti
 imperia solvunt seque luctantur iugo
 eripere rectique in pedes iactant onus.

The earth trembled, everywhere frenzied cattle fled through the fields, and the herdsman took no thought to chase his stock; every wild beast fled from the woodland, every huntsman shuddered, pale with chill fear. Alone undaunted, Hippolytus held the horses on tight reins, and rallied their panic with his encouraging, familiar voice. There is a steep road towards Argos along the broken hills, running close to the reaches of the sea below. Here that colossus whets its anger in preparation. After rousing its mettle and testing itself fully in rehearsal for wrath, it flies forth, fast and direct, scarcely touching the ground's surface with its galloping feet, and halts truculently in front of the panicked team. In response your son rises up with a threatening glare, not changing countenance, and thunders loudly: "This empty terror does not break my spirit, for conquering bulls is a task I inherit from my father."

But straightway the horses, disobedient to the reins, sweep the chariot away. Now, swerving off the road, they head wherever frenzied panic carries their rampage, propelling themselves across the cliffs. But as a helmsman holds a ship steady in turbulent seas, lest it turns broadside, and cheats the waves with his skill, just so he steers the speeding team: now he curbs and drags on their mouths with reins tight, now he controls their backs with repeated use of the coiling whip. He is followed by a constant companion, now keeping equal pace, now whirling around to meet them head-on, bringing terror from every side. Further flight is impossible, for head-on, full in their path, there charges the terrible horned sea-creature. Then indeed the steeds, crazed with fear, reject control and struggle to tear themselves from the yoke: as they rear up, they jettison their burden.

The movement of the bull to the shore (that anticipates its movement on land at 1060–1063) in Seneca's description recalls Vergil (*Aeneid* 2.199–231) when the narrative tracks the movement of the serpents to the shore in order to kill Laocoön and his sons (and scare the bull away that was being sacrificed to Neptune).¹⁴ The description of the serpents is also subsumed in Ovid's description of the sea-monster/ bull (*Aeneid* 2.203–211):¹⁵

14 For an extended analysis of the parallels, cf. Staley (2000: 325–355).

15 I cite the OCT text of R.A.B. Mynors (1990) *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. The translation is by H. Rushton Fairclough (1999), *Virgil: Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I–VI*. Loeb Classical Library.

ecce autem gemini a Tenedo tranquilla per alta
 (horresco referens) immensis orbibus angues
 incumbunt pelago pariterque ad litora tendunt; 205
 pectora quorum inter fluctus arrecta iubaeque
 sanguineae superant undas, pars cetera pontum
 pone legit sinuatque immensa volumine terga.
 fit sonitus spumante salo; iamque arva tenebant
 ardentisque oculos suffecti sanguine et igni 210
 sibila lambebant linguis vibrantibus ora.

[...] and lo! From Tenedos, over the peaceful depths—I shudder as I speak—a pair of serpents with endless coils are breasting the sea side by side making for the shore. Their bosoms rise amid the surge, and their crests, bloodred, overtop the waves; the rest of them skims the main behind and their huge backs curve in many a fold; we hear the noise as the water foams. And now they were gaining the fields and, with blazing eyes suffused with blood and fire, were licking with quivering tongues their hissing mouths.

The snake-like appearance of the bull *et ingens belua immensam trahit/squamosa partem* (1047–1048) in Seneca that evoked Cetus also evokes Vergil's serpents whose eyes also vomit fire (1040–1041).¹⁶ Lines 1059–1061 of the Messenger speech in Seneca also echo the battle between two bulls in Vergil's *Georgics* 3.232–234.

Seneca's description of Hippolytus' death continues to engage Ovid's description of it in the *Metamorphoses* (15.514–529):

corda pavent comitum, mihi mens interrita mansit
 exiliis contenta suis, cum colla feroces 515
 ad freta convertunt adrectisque auribus horrent
 quadrupedes monstrique metu turbantur et altis
 praecipitant currum scopulis; ego ducere vana
 frena manu spumis albetibus oblita luctor
 et retro lentas tendo resupinus habenas. 520
 nec tamen has vires rabies superasset equorum,
 ni rota, perpetuum qua circumvertitur axem,
 stipitis occurso fracta ac disiecta fuisset.

16 Segal (1984) n321 describes the bull: "This creature becomes terrifyingly and pitilessly Other."

excitior curru, lorisque tenentibus artus
 viscera via trahi, nervos in stipe teneri, 525
 membra rapi partim partimque reprensa relinqui,
 ossa gravem dare fracta sonum fessamque videres
 exhalari animam nullasque in corpore partes,
 noscere quas posses: unumque erat omnia vulnus.

The hearts of my companions quaked with fear; but my own soul was unterrified, filled with sad thoughts of exile. Then suddenly my spirited horses faced towards the sea and, with ears pricked forward, quaked and trembled with fear at the monstrous shape; then dashed with the chariot at headlong speed over the steep, rocky way. I vainly strove to check them with the reins, flecked with white foam, and, leaning backward, strained at the tough thongs. Still would the horses' mad strength not have surpassed my own had not a wheel, striking its hub against a projecting stock, been broken and wrenched off from the axle. I was thrown from my car, and while the reins held my legs fast, you might see my living flesh dragged along, my sinews held on the sharp stake, my limbs partly drawn on and in part caught fast and left behind, and my bones broken with a loud, snapping sound. My spent spirit was at last breathed out and there was no part of my body which you could recognize, but it all was one great wound.

Hippolytus narrates events of his own death—he knows that a bull (*taurus*, 15.511) emerges from the sea since events have already happened. In Seneca, however, the description and identification of the bull is a source first of confusion and then of irony since Hippolytus boasts (1066–1067) that he is not afraid and that it is his paternal legacy to conquer the bull not knowing that it was sent by Neptune in fulfillment of his father Theseus' wish to destroy him. The gory description of his dismemberment concludes with a statement describing his body as *unumque erat omnia vulnus* (15.529). In describing Hippolytus' lack of fear of the bull, Seneca compares him to the captain of a ship negotiating a storm (1072–1075). The maritime simile contains dramatic irony since the earlier simile comparing the bull to a whale that destroys ships is known to the audience/reader but not to Hippolytus. The description of Hippolytus' death is equally violent (1085–1104):

Praeceptis in ora fusus implicuit cadens 1085
 laqueo tenaci corpus et quanto magis
 pugnat, sequaces hoc magis nodos ligat.
 sensere pecudes facinus—et curru levi,

dominante nullo, qua timor iussit ruunt.
 talis per auras non suum agnoscens onus 1090
 Solique falso creditum indignans diem
 Phaethonta currus devium excussit polo.
 Late cruentat arva et inlisum caput
 scopulis resultat; auferunt dumi comas,
 et ora durus pulcra populatur lapis 1095
 multo vulnere infelix decor.
 moribunda celeres membra pervolvunt rotae;
 tandemque raptum truncus ambusta sude
 medium per inguen stipite ingesto tenet;
 [paulumque domino currus affixo stetit] 1100
 haesere biiuges vulnere—et pariter moram
 dominumque rumpunt. inde semianimem secant
 virgulta, acutis asperi vepres rubis
 omnisque ruscus corporis partem tulit.

Flung headlong on his face, he catches his body as he falls in a tangling snare. The more he fights, the more he tightens the clinging knots. The beasts sense their misdeed, and with the chariot lightened and no one ruling them, they rush wherever fear bids. Just so in the sky a team, not recognising its proper burden and indignant that daylight was entrusted to a false Sun, tossed the straying Phaethon out of the heavens. Far and wide he bloodies the countryside; his head smashes against boulders and snaps back; brambles tear away his hair; hard stones ravage his handsome face, and his ill-fated beauty is destroyed by many wounds. The swift wheels roll his dying limbs over and over. At last, as he is dragged along, a tree trunk, charred into a stake, grips him with its stock thrust out, right through his groin. The team stops a moment, with its master impaled; the wound halts the yoked pair. Then they break the delay and with it their master. Now barely alive, he is cut by the undergrowth of thornbushes bristling with sharp brambles, and every treetrunk takes part of his body.

The gory description of dismemberment that litters and alters the landscape *inde semianimem secant/ virgulta, acutis asperi vepres rubis/ omnisque, ruscus corporis partem tulit* (1102–1104) recalls the geography of Hippolytus' hunting grounds, formerly expressed in terms of empire, but now his body parts follow and mark the same region in a dramatic irony of the hunter is now hunted.¹⁷

17 The language recalls Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 1.508–510, when Daphne flees Apollo who warns her that her flesh will be torn by thickets.

Like his description of the sea-monster/bull, Seneca fuses another passage in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, the death of Actaeon (*Met.* 3.225–237) to describe Hippolytus' death:

ea turba cupidine praedae 225

per rupes scopulosque aditusque carentia saxa,
 quaque est difficilis quaque est via nulla, sequuntur.
 ille fugit per quae fuerat loca saepe secutus,
 heu! famulos fugit ipse suos. clamare libebat:
 "Actaeon ego sum: dominum cogniscite vestrum!" 230
 verba animo desunt; resonat latratibus aether.
 prima Melanchaetes in tergo vulnera fecit,
 proxima Theridamas, Oresitrophos haesit in armo:
 tardius exierant, sed per compendia montis
 anticipata via est; dominum retinentibus illis, 235
 cetera turba coit confertque in corpore dentes.
 iam loca vulneribus desunt . . .

The whole pack, keen with the lust of blood, over crags, over cliffs, over trackless rocks, where the way is hard, where there is no way at all, follow on. He flees over the very ground where he has oft-times pursued; he flees (the pity of it!) his own faithful hounds. He longs to cry out: "I am Actaeon! Recognize your own master!" But words fail his desire. All the air resounds with their baying. And first Melanchaetes fixes his fangs in his back, Theridamas next; Orestitrophos has fastened on his shoulder. They had set out later than the rest, but by a short-cut across the mountain had outstripped their course. While they hold back their master's flight, the whole pack collects, and all together bury their fangs in his body till there is no place left for further wounds.

Ovid's narrative bears similarities to Euripides' description of the dismemberment of Pentheus in the *Bacchae* but Seneca's Hippolytus is not aware of the intertext of his role-playing of Actaeon.¹⁸ Seneca's inclusion of the Actaeon intertext in the description of Hippolytus' death further extends the metaphorical range of the sea monster/Argo from natural water phenomenon, to

18 Cf. Littlewood (2004: 298): "Most importantly he does not show any awareness of the texts, the narratives, and the figures which make him 'easy material'."

bull with a serpent's body, to a hound as another variant of the dramatic irony that the hunter Hippolytus is now the hunted.¹⁹

Euripides' play ends with the reconciliation between Theseus and the dying Hippolytus. In Seneca, however, Theseus and Hippolytus are never on stage at the same time.²⁰ The play's closing scene (1244–1280) in which Theseus and the chorus try to reassemble Hippolytus' body parts recalls the audience's attention to the gory description of his death: *hoc quid est forma carens/ et turpe, multo vulnere abruptum undique?/ quae pars tui sit dubito; sed pars est tui:/ hic, hic repone, non suo, at vacuo loco* (1265–1268).²¹ Theseus cannot piece his son back together and reverse the dismemberment that he caused. Hippolytus' body now defies description (*Hippolytus hic est?*, 1249) and definition like the body of the sea-monster bull whose amorphous and red appearance it now resembles.

Is the effect of intertextuality on the audience/reader in a dramatic text the same as in epic? Seneca's play negotiates previous versions and intertexts to produce his own unique version of the myth. As a form of metatheatre, intertextuality in the play leads to an evolving awareness of the bull and the threat it poses to Hippolytus.²² It is at once something known and unknown that elicits fear and curiosity as a *monstrum* and a *mirabilium* that confirms and confounds the audience/reader's perception of it and their world. In his discussion of sea creatures, Pliny (*Historia naturalis* 9.4) records that the bones of Cetus measuring 40 feet long were displayed at Rome during the aedileship of M. Aemilius Scaurus in 58 BC. If known by the audience, would this make the bull in the *Phaedra* plausible and the danger it posed to Hippolytus more terrifying? To an audience in Imperial Rome, it could also signal the bound-

19 Cf. Littlewood (2004: 296–298) for the scene of his death as an inversion of his entrance song in Act 1 where he leads dogs soiled with blood of prey.

20 There is added dramatic irony since the same actor played both roles, as Kohn (2013: 80): "In a dramaturgical sense, Theseus truly deprives Hippolytus of life, because when the one character is onstage, there is not an actor available to portray the other."

21 "What is this ugly formless thing, that multiple wounds have severed on every side? What part it may be I am uncertain, but it is part of you. Here, set it down here, in an empty place if not in its proper place." Cf. Erasmo (2008: 60–61) for the scene of piecing Hippolytus' body back together as a corruption of the Roman funerary ritual of *ossilegium*.

22 On intertextuality as metatheatre, cf. Thumiger (2009: 34) "This device promotes engagement between audience and spectacle by pointing at the 'story' as part of a tradition, or connected with previous texts, allowing the audience to appreciate and evaluate allusions, new versions of the plot, and creative re-elaborations."

ary of empire and the *mirabilia* at its edges.²³ The audience/reader knows of the threat to Hippolytus before he or the messenger does based on knowledge of the myth in theatre and epic intertexts that derive ultimately from Accius' description of the Argo.²⁴ As both a performance text and a dramatic text, the play also engages with a viewer's/reader's experience with previous theatre texts and other spectacle entertainments to affect the way in which Seneca's audience/reader contextualizes, simultaneously, the action on stage and the intertextual allusions.²⁵

The dramatic effects of intertexts vary and may contribute to the audience/reader's understanding or even confusion. In Seneca, intertextuality may subject the audience/reader to manipulation by creating a false expectation of what will follow and/or by using intertexts to confound the reader/audience by using familiar intertexts in an unfamiliar way to affect audience/reader reaction or understanding of a scene. In *Troades*, Act 5 (1068–1074) for example, the messenger describes the tower from which Astyanax will be thrown (or throw himself as the audience learns later in an unexpected twist to the myth): *Est una magna turris e Troia super, assueta Priamo, cuius e fastigio/ summisque pinnis arbiter belli sedens/ regebat acies* (1068–1071). The passage sets up the expectation of a reference to Priam watching the battle from the height of the Scaean Gates with Helen (*Iliad* 3.181–244) but in the following sentence, Seneca gives the name Astyanax after the verb *fovens*: *turre in hac blando sinu/ fovens nepotem* (1071–1072). Did Seneca manipulate the audience/reader into thinking of Helen on Priam's lap before the word *nepotem* makes the identity of the direct object clear and any connection with Helen absurd? Does the

23 Williams (2012: 37–48) discusses the differences between Seneca and Pliny's worldviews as it relates to *mirabilia* and Rome's (self)perception that is instructive here for Seneca's authorial engagement with nature: "For Seneca, however, *mirabilia* and the rhetoric of *mirum* give way to a plainer rhetoric of necessity in nature's functioning, and we move away from Rome as the triumphant, centralized showcase of amassed *mirabilia* to a cosmically revisionist view of Rome's relative (un)importance as a mere temporal and spatial *punctum*." (44).

24 Kohn (2013: 142): "The tragedies contain numerous instances of the omission of important plot points [. . .]. Either Seneca took it for granted that his audience would be aware of both the myth and previous renditions of it, or else he did not consider such awareness to be necessary for appreciating the play. In either case, surely a spectator who was familiar with other versions would add an additional dimension to the proceedings by recognizing what had been omitted."

25 Elam (1980: 209) considers that intertextuality also relates to the reciprocal relationship between the dramatic text and the performance text.

manipulation of the reader's recollection of the *Iliad* create a sense of mistrust and put the audience/reader on guard for further intertextual red herrings?

In the case of the *Phaedra*, we enter the theatre and/or the dramatic reality of the play informed by our experience of previous plays and intertexts but Hippolytus does not enter ours (audience's reality) so, like the shepherd in Accius' play, he has no experience with the Argo or sea monsters as intertexts to the one he is now facing and so his reaction (and the reaction of the messenger) is unscripted and unrehearsed. The audience may fear for Hippolytus' safety before he is aware of the danger posed by the bull but the role of the audience is negotiated through the dramatist's manipulation of the action since it can react to its own successful or failed interpretation of what is going on in the play based on intertexts or react to a character's reaction as part of the negotiated experience of theatre. In *Jaws*, the soundtrack that incites the audience to fear before the actual appearance of the shark creates dramatic tension since the victims do not hear it and we do not see the shark after it has claimed several victims. Although warned that an attack is imminent (based on previous attacks in the movie), the audience cannot warn the characters. This is more than an example of dramatic irony (audience has knowledge that a character on stage does not) since, like the *Phaedra*, our awareness signals a change in roles and reactions to the plot based on our experience with intertexts outside of the play. The audience's perception of reality whether of its own or of the fictional reality of the play is subject to further manipulation: in the *Phaedra*, the disturbance at sea is not the actual danger but a warning sign of the bull's arrival. In *Jaws*, the music conditions the audience to fear a shark attack but the shark only attacks when the "warning" music stops. Audience fear of the unknown replaces fear of the known.

Metatheatre is more than the breaking of the dramatic illusion between actor and audience, it is the totality of the writing and viewing/reading experience that is essential for an understanding of the (dramatic) text written by a dramatist as part of an associative and negotiable theatre event that produces a new (performance) text each time a play is staged.²⁶ Related to the associative experience of writing and viewing of performance events is the issue of authorial control within the negotiable environment of the theatre—the extent to which the dramatist loses control of the text once the performance

26 Thumiger (2009: 12): "The theatrical experience, in fact, is by definition a fluid, liminal one, where the boundaries between what one might wish to define as 'real' vs. 'fictitious', public vs. stage, actors vs. characters are shifting and continuously re-negotiated in the open field of the interaction between audience and spectacle."

begins.²⁷ Actors may alter the text or emphasize meanings not intended by the dramatist or the audience may understand a line, an actor's gestures, or scene, or even the play's meaning differently than intended based on personal experiences and events, contemporary and historic, that occur outside the theatre. Characters on stage contribute to the associative experience as both participants of the drama and audience to their own stage actions and previous intertexts.²⁸

The changing status of the actor contributes to the on-going negotiable experience of the theatre that makes a basic question such as who is on stage a complicated one due to associative ambiguity. Is the actor playing the role of a character in the play? Is the actor playing the role of a contemporary or historic figure in the play, such as in a *fabula praetexta*? Or conversely, is a contemporary figure on stage as a character in the play, such as when Pompey inserted his own triple triumph into the dramatic action of Accius' *Clytemnestra* in place of and through an association with Agamemnon's triumphal entry onto the stage at the opening games of his theatre in 55 BC? Nero acting on stage in roles wearing masks of his own likeness or that of his current mistress (Suetonius *Nero* 21.3, Dio 63.9.5) were intended to blur the distinction between himself and his stage roles so Nero the matricide off-stage invited comparisons to Nero as matricide when playing Orestes on-stage. The same audience was also apparently ready to see Nero playing the role of arsonist who recited an epic poem on the Fall of Troy as Rome burned (Suetonius *Nero* 38, Tacitus *Annales* 15.38–43, Dio 62.16–18).

This negotiable status of the actor's persona/identity contributes to the reciprocity of the associative experience between the theatre and other spectacle entertainment venues like the amphitheatre where audiences expect death and gore as part of the entertainment.²⁹ The enactment of myths on stage

27 Cf. Harrison (2000: 138): "Once the play leaves the nurturing preserve of the poet's mind, it enters the public domain whence the integrity of the poet's vision can never be guarded or rescued."

28 Erasmo (2004: 122): "When the audience's own theatricalized reality is incorporated into stage reality, the metatragedy of Seneca results: theatricality replaces theatre as characters become their own audience watching or commenting on their own theatricalized stage actions. The audience itself shifts roles from spectator to witness when the theatricalized stage actions of actors compete with their own perception of the world outside of the theatre, making the recognition of dramatic illusion on the stage and the interpretation of dramatic allusion off the stage difficult."

29 Cf. Boyle (2006: 182): "It is arguable that, in early Imperial Rome's confounding culture, personal identity began to be constructed from the performance of a plurality and socially determined roles, thus collapsing the distinction between *persona* and person. Certainly

and in the arena also produces a type of scenic intertextuality where similar reactions to similar stage and staged actions create an augmented reality in which violence is at once an associative and normative experience.³⁰ In the *Phaedra*, the audience's focus is first aimed at the bull as it advances towards Hippolytus whose death sentence places him in the role of a *damnatus ad bestias* facing execution in the arena.³¹ As the scene unfolds, Hippolytus is compared to a charioteer as he tries to outpace the bull (1072–1079) but the scenic intertextuality shifts from the circus back to the arena for Hippolytus' death when he is entangled in the reins (1086) as though the trapped victim of a *retiarius* gladiator who was armed as a fisherman with a net and trident. Intertextuality with Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* when Agamemnon is caught in the nets of Clytemnestra may also be part of the associative viewing experience that illustrates the potential of simultaneous and complex associations between dramatic texts and the theatre and amphitheater. Of course, the audience's perception of its own world informs its perception of the augmented

the distinction between 'reality' and 'theatre' dissolves conspicuously within the theatre/amphitheatre itself, where buildings burn, actors bleed, spectators are thrust into the arena, human and animal bodies dismembered, and pain, suffering, death become objects of the theatrical gaze and of theatrical pleasure." Beacham (1992: 180) situates the shared responses to spectacle in various venues to the shared elements of staging: "Even when the context of a reference makes it certain that the event described occurred in the circus or amphitheatre, it may plausibly suggest theatrical practice as well, since from the earliest times the distinction between activities appropriate to each venue does not appear to have been rigidly defined by Romans, and, as Servius suggests later, the same personnel were customarily responsible for scenic spectacle wherever it took place." Leigh (1997: 234–91) examines the reciprocity of the viewing experience between the amphitheatre and Lucan's epic technique.

- 30 Coleman (1990: 73): "The amphitheatre was where one went to witness and participate in a spectacle of death: the death of animals and men, specifically the deaths of worthless and harmful persons. Whatever the crises of an emperor's reign and threats to the stability of his regime, there were people and animals available for sacrifice who, by dying violently, would earn him popular acclaim and demonstrate his authority over life and death. What makes our charades unique in the history of the *ludi* is the mythological context in which they were performed: to witness the enactment of myth here was to experience not escapism but reality, and the emperor who verified myth worked a miracle. Justice was seen to be done, and the death of the criminal was all the more degrading for the short-lived glamour of his mythological role."
- 31 Coleman (1990: 55): "There is some evidence that those who were *damnati ad bestias* were dispatched in the arena during the midday pause between the morning's *venationes* and the afternoon *munera*. This pause seems to have been observed regularly from the time of Claudius onwards (Suetonius *Claud.* 34.2)."

reality of the theatre but the extent to which the audience is able to substitute the theatre's reality for its own is part of the negotiated experience of the theatre.³²

Within the physical and figurative space of the theatre, the dramatic settings can be represented on stage or imagined to exist in the fictional/dramatic reality of the play in scenes described off-stage to create a (meta-)theatre within the (actual) theatre. As a figurative space, each audience member creates their own (meta-)theatre that augments the cues given by Seneca in the text. In the messenger speech, Seneca simultaneously locates and generalizes the location of Hippolytus' death by introducing it with the poetic *est locus* construction from epic that normally removes the reader from the current location and context of the narrative to another region: *Est alta ad Argos collibus ruptis via,/ vicina tangens spatia supposit maris;/ hic se illa moles acuit atque iras parat*" (1057–1059). Seneca does not give the direction in which Hippolytus was fleeing or the exact geographic location of his death as Euripides: the road to Argos and Epidauros (1197) and the region facing the Saronic Gulf (1198–2000). By generalizing the location of Hippolytus' death, Seneca creates a liminal space that shifts the narrative focus to the bull that is described as *illa moles* (1059) in its final metaphorical transformation in which it takes on the appearance of the current confining topography of hills along the shore.³³ The bull's latest form also looks back to its initial appearance in the sea and its evocation of Accius' Argo as *moles*.

Since the events take place off-stage, Seneca creates a (meta-)theatre within the theatre for the audience to visualize the death of Hippolytus against the shared scenic intertexts of the amphitheatre and circus. As quickly as the bull dominates the barren location, it disappears from it as though through the trap door in the floor of the arena so that the audience's attention can focus on the next spectacle engagement of Hippolytus' death and the impact that his mutilation has on the landscape. Seneca's transformation of the topography in the fictional reality of the play into figurative theatre space is made more explicit in the *Troades* in which the messenger describes the topography surrounding Achilles' tomb that was the setting for Polyxena's sacrifice as being

32 Cf. Williams (2012: 33) for a discussion of Hadot's characterization of utilitarian perception: "The utilitarian perception we have of the world, in everyday life, in fact hides us from the world *qua* world. Aesthetic and philosophical perceptions of the world are only possible by means of a complete transformation of our relationship to the world: we have to perceive it *for itself*, and no longer *for ourselves*."

33 Segal (1984: 321–324) describes the landscape as a "void" that contributes to the narrative effect of entrapment.

“in the manner of a theatre”: *cuius extremum latus/ Rhoetea leni verberant fluctu uada;/ aduersa cingit campus et clivo levi/ erecta medium vallis includens locum/ crescit theatri more* (1121–1125).³⁴ The spectators of Polyxena’s sacrifice in the play mirror the same fascination and revulsion of the bloody spectacle as Seneca’s audience.

The figurative theatre of Hippolytus’ death creates an augmented reality within the physical theatre through the manipulation of poetic intertexts from Accius’ *Medea sive Argonautae* to Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* and scenic intertexts from the amphitheatre and circus. Each audience member/reader creates their own (meta-)theatre that augments the cues given by the text and dramatic production. In this (meta-)theatre, the negotiable status of an actor’s persona/identity contributes to the reciprocity of the associative experience in which the viewer/reader relates the Hippolytus and sea-monster/bull of Seneca’s play to others encountered in texts or in shared visual experiences prior to entering the theatre. This was no boat accident? The Argo killed Hippolytus through an associative viewing/reading experience of Roman tragedy in the (meta-)theatre.

34 Fitch (2002): “Its far edge is beaten by the soft waves of the Rhoetean strait; around the facing side is level ground; a gently rising valley-side, which encloses the intervening space, slopes up in the form of a theatre.”

Roman Tragedy—Ciceronian Tragedy? Cicero's Influence on Our Perception of Republican Tragedy

Petra Schierl

Of the tragedies written in Rome in the third and second centuries BC only fragments survive in the form of quotations by ancient authors.¹ By far the largest number of fragments has been preserved in lexicographical works of the imperial period, in Nonius' *De compendiosa doctrina* and in Festus' epitome of Verrius Flaccus' dictionary *De verborum significatu*. Both adduce quotations to illustrate the meaning of a word, often citing no more than a single verse. Arguably, the richest source of knowledge about Republican tragedy, however, is Marcus Tullius Cicero. His writings abound in quotations from comedy and tragedy, attesting to a lifelong engagement with early Roman drama.² While the number of fragments from Republican tragedy which have come down to us through his works is relatively small, Cicero quotes the longest and most substantial passages of the major tragic writers, Ennius (239–169 BCE), Pacuvius (c. 220–130 BCE) and Accius (170–c. 80 BCE).³ Ennius may serve as an example: Cicero is the source for 30 out of 216 fragments, that is of 14 per cent of the extant fragments from Ennian tragedy; however, citing 135 out of 402 verses, he preserves 34 per cent of the tragic remains of Ennius.⁴ Since he frequently omits the name of the authors whose works he cites, he transmits 78 out of 180 *fragmenta adespota* from Republican tragedy.⁵ With 17 and 18 verses respectively, the lament from Ennius' *Andromacha* (23 *TrRF*) and the speech of

1 Goldberg (2007: 582) justly emphasizes this aspect when he observes: "Our knowledge of tragedy includes not just the fragmentary texts, but the whole texts that preserve them: the history of its art comes wrapped in the history of its reception. Understanding that art therefore requires understanding the terms of its survival."

2 His rhetorical and philosophical works abound in poetic quotations; a smaller percentage is contained in the letters, the smallest in the speeches; cf. Kubik (1887) and Zillinger (1911, esp. 50–68).

3 This is also observed by Zetzel (2007: 1) who discusses the importance of Cicero as a source for Ennius. On the biographies and the output of Ennius, Pacuvius and Accius, cf. (2011: 204–25) with further literature.

4 Cicero cites 15 out of 273 fragments of Pacuvius and 28 out of 476 fragments of Accius (the numbers refer to fragments for which the author is named, including those that are cited by Cicero alongside other authors).

5 184–254 *TrRF*.

Cassandra (151 *TrRF*) are the longest fragments from Republican tragedy which survive through his works.⁶ These examples also illustrate Cicero's habit of citing certain "favourite" passages repeatedly in different contexts: he quotes from Andromacha's plaint no less than nine times in four works (*Pro Sestio*, *De oratore*, *Orator*, *Tusculanae disputationes*) and from Cassandra's speech five times in three works (*Epistulae ad Atticum*, *Orator*, *De divinatione*). Cicero, moreover, sheds light on different aspects of Republican tragedy, since he refers to tragedy for a variety of reasons, showing an interest in linguistic phenomena such as the archaic genitive, but also in issues relating to the plot or the portrayal of character.⁷ What is more, he often comments on quotations and provides valuable information on lost plays, for example by making reference to the speaker or the situational context of the verses he quotes or to performances in the Rome of his day.

Cicero was writing at a time when tragedy still played a vital role in the cultural life of Rome. Not so much new plays, but revival performances of the "classics" were put on stage in the late Republic. The plays of the major tragic poets, Ennius, Pacuvius and Accius, continued to be read and performed so that many were known to a broad public.⁸ In addition, Roman comedy and tragedy were used in rhetorical training as manuals like the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* or Cicero's *De inventione* demonstrate.⁹ Drama thus played a role in oratorical education, but also more generally in discussions pertaining to rhetoric as evoked in the dialogue *De oratore*. This close engagement with drama in turn led members of the Roman elite such as Asinius Pollio or Cicero's brother Quintus to devote themselves to composing tragedies.¹⁰

Marcus Tullius Cicero stands out as the most important witness of this crucial period in the reception of the early plays, and his value as a source both for the history of Republican drama¹¹ and for the knowledge of tragedy, in particular,

6 Other fragments of more than ten verses are the account of Hecuba's dream, which may belong to Ennius' *Alexander* (76 *TrRF adespota*), the lament of Odysseus from Pacuvius' *Niptra* (R³ 256–269) and the description of the Argo by a herdsman who has never seen a ship in Accius' *Medea* / *Argonautae* (R³ 391–402).

7 Schierl (2006: 40–42) on Pacuvius.

8 Goldberg (2005: 126–28) discusses manifestations of a "dual experience of tragedy" in Cicero's writings; on revival performances and reception through reading, cf. Manuwald (2011: 108–25).

9 Fantham (2004: 140–46).

10 Boyle (2006: 145); cf. 141 *TrRF tragici minores* on Q. Tullius Cicero and 144–145 *TrRF tragici minores* on C. Asinius Pollio.

11 Cicero's references to dramatic performances, actors and playwrights can be found in Wright (1931); cf. now 17–29 *TrRF Testimonia*; for the *testimonia* on Roman drama in general, cf. Manuwald (2010: 42–101).

can hardly be underestimated. The poetic quotations in Cicero's writings and, more specifically, his engagement with tragedy have long attracted scholarly attention.¹² However, the wealth of information offered by Cicero should not hide the fact that even he provides but a partial view of Republican tragedy. In this regard two issues deserve further consideration. Firstly, Cicero cites only from a selection of the plays attested for Ennius, Pacuvius and Accius¹³ and hardly refers to those of Naevius and Livius Andronicus at all.¹⁴ The tragic quotations in his writings thus mirror at least to some extent the canonizing processes at work in the late Republic.¹⁵ Secondly, his statements may be tendentious, since he quotes from and refers to Roman tragedy in accordance with his own literary agenda.

Examining how Cicero affects the way we look at Ennius as a poet, James Zetzel observes: "Cicero's Ennius is Cicero's: he read, quoted, and used different works of Ennius for different reasons in different contexts and at different times of his life, and what a consummate rhetorician and stylist does with his materials should not be taken unreflectively as an accurate representation of what those materials meant in their original context."¹⁶ A similar argument can be made about Cicero's influence on the way we perceive the tragic output of individual playwrights and about the picture of Republican tragedy that emerges from his writings. Using Cicero's writings, above all the philosophical

12 On poetic quotations, cf. Kubik (1887); Zillinger (1911); Shackleton-Bailey (1983); Dueck (2009) and for Greek poetry cf. Jocelyn (1973); on Cicero's engagement with tragedy, cf. also Wright (1931); Michel (1983); Auvray-Assayas (1998); Eigler (2000); Goldberg (2000); Aricò (2004); for literature on quotations in the *Tusculan disputations*, cf. below n. 28.

13 The following survey focuses exclusively on tragedies on Greek myth and is based on the *TrRF*-edition of Ennius by Manuwald (2012), on Pacuvius by Schierl (2006) and on Accius by Dangel (1995). From the twenty tragedies attested for Ennius Cicero quotes from seven: *Achilles*, *Alcmeo*, *Andromacha*, *Iphigenia*, *Medea (exul)*, *Telamo*, *Thyestes*; besides, he mentions *Ajax* and *Melanippa*. From the twelve tragedies of Pacuvius he quotes from five: *Antiopa*, *Chryses*, *Iliona*, *Niptra*, *Teucer*; he also alludes to a verse of the *Hermiona*; in addition, he may quote from Pacuvius' *Armorum iudicium* and *Medus*; but the ascription remains speculative, since Cicero does not give the name of the author or the title of the play. From the forty-six tragedies of Accius Cicero quotes from four: *Atrous*, *Eurysaces*, *Medea sive Argonautae*, *Philocteta*; in addition, verses he cites are likely to be attributable to *Oenomaus* and *Epinausimache*. Cf. also Spahlinger (2005: 225, 229–33); Schierl (2006: 40–42).

14 Cicero quotes a verse from *Hector proficiscens* (14 *TrRF*) and gives two quotations from tragedies without referring to the title (41–42 *TrRF*); there are no quotations from the tragedies of Livius Andronicus, on which he remarks in *Brutus* (71) that they are not worth being read twice (4 *TrRF Testimonia*).

15 Spahlinger (2005: 246, 343).

16 Zetzel (2007: 16).

dialogues, as a source for lost poetic works thus requires an understanding of his quotation practices and his literary and philosophical aims.¹⁷ As readily as we may turn to Cicero when discussing Republican tragedy, we have to ask which function a quotation is to serve within the context of his work. This determines after all what he chooses to quote as well as the form the quotation takes and the meaning it acquires within the new context. In-depth discussions of the function that a quotation may serve should therefore not be confined to studies whose interpretative focus lies on Cicero. They rather ought to provide the basis for inquiries into questions pertaining to Republican tragedy—questions as different as plot reconstruction, the portrayal of character or the nature of tragic heroism.¹⁸

In this chapter I shall reconsider a series of quotations from Pacuvius' *Niptra* in the *Tusculan disputations* (2.47–50) in order to show how Cicero influences our perception of Republican tragedy. The passage has attracted scholarly attention for a suggestive comparison between Pacuvius and Sophocles: Cicero judges Pacuvius' portrayal of the fatally wounded Odysseus to be better than that of the Greek playwright who presented the hero reduced to tears. In a close-reading of this passage, I shall discuss how Cicero exploits for his own argument the interpretative possibilities that arise when Pacuvius' verses are newly contextualized. Before turning to the passage in question, I shall set out what we know about Pacuvius' *Niptra* and give a brief introduction to the *Tusculan disputations*, sketching above all the argument of the discussion on pain in book 2.

1 The *Niptra* of Pacuvius

Nine fragments are attested for Pacuvius' *Niptra*, while another four fragments are usually ascribed to the play for matters of content.¹⁹ With the lament of Odysseus, Cicero preserves the most substantial passage. From the title *Niptra* ("Foot washing") it may be inferred that the play adapted in one way or another the famous scene in book 19 of the *Odyssey*, where Odysseus returns to Ithaca in disguise and the nurse recognizes him by his scar when she washes his feet.²⁰

17 Spahlinger (2005: 342–43).

18 What is stressed here with regard to Cicero applies likewise to other authors who preserve fragments from Republican tragedy as rightly pointed out by Goldberg (2007: 574, 582).

19 For three of these (R³ 244, 246, 401, 402–403) Pacuvius is mentioned as the author.

20 Hom. *Od.* 19.379–507. Cicero (*Tusc.* 5.46 = 247 R³) and Gellius (2.26 = 244–246 R³) cite verses from this scene which are usually attributed to the *Niptra*, though neither of them

The verses cited by Cicero in *Tusculanae disputationes* 2 suggest, moreover, that the hero was fatally wounded and died at the end of Pacuvius' tragedy. The death of Odysseus was treated in the *Telegony*, the last poem of the epic cycle. In the summary of this poem, Proclus relates that Telegonus, the son born to Odysseus by Circe, came to Ithaca and killed his father whom he did not recognize.²¹ The extant fragments thus suggest that Pacuvius' *Niptra* dealt both with the return of the hero and with his death, though it is not clear how this was done.²²

Cicero, moreover, informs us that Pacuvius' Odysseus does not lament as much as his Sophoclean counterpart.²³ Which tragedy of Sophocles does he have in mind? The title *Νίπτρα* is indeed attested for Sophocles in Photius' *Lexicon* (451a *TrRF tragici minores*). The murder of Odysseus was, however, the subject of Sophocles' *Ὀδυσσεὺς Ἀκανθοπλήξ*, "Odysseus stricken with the bone of a sting-ray" (453–461 *TrRF tragici minores*). The *Ἀκανθοπλήξ* is perhaps to be identified with the *Τραυματίας Ὀδυσσεύς*, "Odysseus wounded", mentioned in Aristotle's *Poetics* (1453b33) as a tragedy in which the protagonist unintentionally kills a relative. Since it is unlikely that Sophocles would have treated events as distant as the hero's return to Ithaca and his death in one and the same play, it is commonly assumed that Pacuvius combined two plays of Sophocles, the *Νίπτρα* and the *Ὀδυσσεὺς Ἀκανθοπλήξ*, in his *Niptra*.²⁴ Plausible as this assumption may be, it seems necessary to sound a note of caution. Though Cicero attests that both playwrights treated the lament of the wounded hero, he is rather vague as regards the relationship between the respective plays or rather scenes. That Pacuvius used a Sophoclean tragedy as a model and adapted it with considerable freedom is a probable inference from Cicero's statement,²⁵ but it is made on the assumption that he knew both plays and could compare them. However, it cannot be taken for granted that he could read each play in its entirety. While Cicero's extensive quotations from Pacuvius suggest that he had at least the Latin tragedy in front of him, he may have come across relevant passages from a Sophoclean play as quotations in his Greek philosophical sources.²⁶

gives the title of the play and Cicero does not even refer to Pacuvius as the author; cf. Schierl (2006: 400–403).

21 For similar versions of his death, cf. Ps-Apollod. *Epit.* 7.34–37 and Hygin. *Fab.* 127 with Schierl (2006: 389).

22 For a detailed discussion, cf. Schierl (2006: 386–400) with further literature.

23 *Tusc.* 2.49 *Pacuvius hoc melius quam Sophocles; apud illum enim perquam flebiliter Ulixes lamentatur in volnere.*

24 Venini (1954: 175–87); cf. also Schierl (2006: 392 n. 13) with further literature.

25 So, for example, Manuwald (2011: 285)

26 Gildenhard (2008) points to "the likelihood that Cicero read neither of the Greek plays in their entirety but rather encountered the relevant passage—from whatever play—as

From Cicero's comparison it can therefore not be deduced with absolute certainty that Pacuvius used Sophocles as a model.

The survey of the evidence already shows the importance of Cicero as a witness for Pacuvius' *Niptra*: Not only has he preserved the longest fragment of the play, but he is also the only one to inform us that the *Niptra* dealt with the death of Odysseus. His comparison of Pacuvius and Sophocles, moreover, reveals that the Greek playwright likewise treated the death of Odysseus and suggests—if no more than that—that he may have provided Pacuvius' model.

2 Newly Contextualized: Verses from *Niptra* in Cicero's *Tusculan disputations* 2

The five books of *Tusculan disputations*, composed in 45 BC, are presented as the written record of conversations on ethical questions at Cicero's villa at Tusculum. Taking the form of lectures (*scholae*) in the Greek manner, the dialogues feature just two speakers.²⁷ Cicero assumes the role of the teacher who refutes a thesis proposed by an unidentified interlocutor. Quotations from Latin and Greek poetry are especially prominent in this dialogue which puts rhetoric explicitly in the service of philosophy.²⁸

In book 2 of the *Tusculan disputations* Cicero responds to the thesis of his interlocutor that pain is the greatest evil. He first convinces him that dishonour is worse than pain, then he rejects common misconceptions about the nature of pain and argues that pain can be overcome through virtue.²⁹ In the second half of the book Cicero points to courage strengthened by habituation (*consuetudo*) and to reason (*ratio*) as means to endure physical pain. In the course of this discussion Cicero quotes extensively from Roman and Greek tragedy, hardly ever from other genres: a hexameter from a satire of Lucilius constitutes

an excerpt in one of his philosophical sources." On Cicero's practice of taking over quotations from his philosophical sources, cf. Jocelyn (1973: 66, 77) with Spahlinger (2005: 13).

27 *Tusc.* 1.7; on the formal enigmas of the *Tusculans*, cf. Gildenhard (2007: 5–78). Schofield (2013: 81–83) on *Cic. Div.* 2.2 offers a concise introduction to the treatise.

28 With 315 verses from Greek and Roman poetry the *Tusculans* feature more quotations than Cicero's other dialogues, as Lundström (1982) 7 points out; cf. also Gildenhard (2007: 36–37, 134) and Schofield (2013: 82). Zillinger (1911: 89–187) gives a survey of Cicero's quotations from and references to Latin poetry, on the *Tusculans*, cf. Zillinger (1911: 172–74); for discussions of citations in the *Tusculans*, cf. Michel (1983) on *Tusc.* 2–4; Aricò (2004); Degl'Innocenti Pierini (2004) on *Tusc.* 1; Salamon (2004) on *Tusc.* 1–2; Spahlinger (2005: 132–72) on *Tusc.* 1.

29 For a summary of the argument, cf. Gildenhard (2007: 256–67).

the exception.³⁰ Clusters of rather substantial quotations are to be found in three places and appear to underline the book's structure. The following discussion will focus on these clusters, the last of which features the verses from Pacuvius' *Niptra*.

Cicero's refutation of misconceptions about pain takes the form of a doxographical survey that reaches a climax with the criticism of Epicurus. Contrary to Epicurus, Cicero advocates the position that pain cannot simply be ignored, even though it does not constitute the greatest evil. In order to illustrate the power of pain Cicero quotes at *Tusculanae disputationes* 2.19–25 the speeches of lament of three famous heroes of Greek tragedy: Philoctetes, Heracles and Prometheus. He probably resorts to Accius' translation of Sophocles' *Philoctetes*, but adduces his own translations of Heracles' lament in Sophocles' *Trachiniae* and of that of Prometheus in Aeschylus' *Prometheus Unbound*.³¹ With 45 and 28 verses respectively these translations stand out for their length and prompt a discussion of Cicero's quotation practices. In this context Cicero mentions the lectures of contemporary philosophers at Athens, in particular those of Philo of Larisa, as models for his frequent use of quotations.³² Having turned to tragedy to show that physical pain cannot simply be ignored as Epicurus would have it, Cicero goes on to criticize the tragic poets in the manner of Plato. He blames them for presenting heroes reduced to tears and for establishing negative examples that enfeeble the human soul. According to him, the poets "crush in this way all the sinews of virtue".³³

In the second half of the book Cicero adduces extensive quotations from two Roman tragedies to underline his thesis that habituation (*consuetudo*) and reason (*ratio*) may enable us to endure physical pain. At *Tusculanae disputationes* 2.38–39 he supports his argument on habituation by pointing to the Homeric hero Eurypylos, "a trained veteran, who is braver for that reason",³⁴ who keeps his composure when wounded and informs Patroclus about the situation of the Greeks (*Iliad* 11.804–848). Cicero does not quote Homer but Ennius, who adapted the scene in a tragedy of unknown title (153 *TrRF*). He cites altogether twelve

30 The book opens with a quotation from Ennius (147 *TrRF*); in the dialogue itself Cicero quotes thirteen times from Roman or Greek tragedy and once from Lucilius (150 M.), citing altogether 124 verses as quotations. There is, moreover, an allusion to a verse from Pacuvius' *Hermiona* (177 R³; 139 Schierl) at *Tusc.* 2.47.

31 Discussing the reception of Sophocles' depiction of pain in the *Philoctetes* and the *Trachiniae* Budelmann (2007: 447) comments on Cicero's discussion.

32 On *Tusc.* 2.26, cf. Degl'Innocenti Pierini (2004: 44–45) and Spahlinger (2005: 188–89), who rightly emphasizes that these remarks must be understood within their immediate context.

33 *Tusc.* 2.27 *sic . . . nervos omnes virtutis elidunt.*

34 *Tusc.* 2.38 *ille exercitatus et vetus ob eamque rem fortior.*

verses from Ennius' play before turning to discuss reason at *Tusculanae disputationes* 2.42.

In the last section of the book Cicero argues that reason has the power to control pain and enjoins his interlocutor to rule over himself. Starting from the premise of a bipartite division of the soul, Cicero insists that the rational part ought to restrain the weak and impulsive elements. He explains that the mode of commanding depends on the relationship between these parts of the soul: While the feeble part needs to be controlled like a slave, if it behaves shamefully, it may in some cases suffice to admonish it like a soldier who is recalled to duty. To illustrate how this can be done Cicero refers to the moderately lamenting Odysseus in Pacuvius' *Niptra*, who regains composure when rebuked by his attendants. At *Tusculanae disputationes* 2.48–51 he quotes fourteen verses from Pacuvius. I shall give the passage here in its entirety and then proceed to discuss the relevant sections one by one.³⁵

...qui autem erunt firmiores nec tamen robustissimi, hos admonitu oportebit, ut bonos milites revocatos, dignitatem tueri. Non nimis in Niptris ille sapientissimus Graeciae saucius lamentatur vel modice potius: "Pedetemptim," inquit, "[ite] et sedato nisu ne succussu arripiat maior dolor."

49. Pacuvius hoc melius quam Sophocles; apud illum enim perquam flebiliter Ulixes lamentatur in vulnere. Tamen huic leviter gementi illi ipsi qui ferunt saucium, personae gravitatem intuentes, non dubitant dicere:

"Tu quoque, Ulixes, quamquam graviter cernimus ictum, nimis paene animo es molli, qui consuetus in armis <sis> aevom agere."

Intellegit poeta prudens ferendi doloris consuetudinem esse non contemnendam magistram.

50. Atque ille non inmoderate magno in dolore:

"Retinete, tenete! Opprimit ulcus; nude! Heu miserum me: excrucior."

Incipit labi, deinde ilico desinit:

"Operite, abscedite, iam iam <me>, mittite! Nam attrectatu et quassu saevum amplificatis dolorem."

35 I quote the text of Giusta (1984) with modifications of punctuation and follow the translation of Douglas (1990: 45–47) with occasional changes. On the text of Pacuvius' fragments, cf. Schierl (2006: 412–15).

Videsne ut obmutuerit? Non sedatus corporis, sed castigatus animi dolor.³⁶ Itaque in extremis Niptris alios quoque obiurgat idque moriens:

“Conqueri fortunam adversam, non lamentari decet.

Id viri est officium; fletus muliebri ingenio additus.”

51. Huius animi pars illa mollior rationi sic paruit ut severo imperatori miles pudens.

... but [it will be necessary to watch] over those who are stronger but not the toughest by admonition like good soldiers recalled to duty. In *Niptra* the wisest man in Greece when wounded does not lament to excess—or rather moderately:

“Go slowly,” he says, “and with placid stride, for fear greater pain might seize me with the jolting.”

49. Pacuvius handles this better than Sophocles; for in Sophocles Odysseus laments over his wounds most tearfully. Even so at his slight groans the very people who are carrying the wounded man, considering the dignity of his character, do not hesitate to say:

“You too, Odysseus, although we see you gravely stricken, are of too weak a spirit, accustomed though you are to spend your days under arms.”

The poet sensibly realises that the habit of bearing pain is a teacher not to be despised.

50. And the hero, not excessively, in his great pain:

“Keep hold of me! Hold me! My wound overwhelms me. Uncover it. Oh how I suffer! I am in agony.”

He begins to lose grip, then stops immediately:

“Cover it up: go away at once now. Leave me alone: with your touch and your shaking you increase the fierce pain.”

Do you see how he has fallen silent? The pain of the body has not been soothed, but checked in the mind by a rebuke. So at the end of *Niptra* he criticises others too, and that when dying:

“It is seemly to deplore ill fortune but not to bewail it: that is a man’s duty; weeping is bestowed on women’s natures.”

51. That feeble part of his soul obeyed reason just as a conscientious soldier obeys a stern commander.

Following the discussion of Pacuvius’ verses Cicero resumes his argument and emphasizes that Odysseus could restrain himself, because the feeble part of the soul followed the commands of reason. Finally he turns to the wise man

36 On punctuation and translation of this sentence, cf. below n. 51.

in whom reason guides the feeble part of the soul as a just parent guides good children. Cicero concedes that he has never met a wise man as described by the philosophers. While the wise man remains an ideal, Odysseus constitutes a role model.

3 The Quotations from Pacuvius' *Niptra* and Cicero's Comments

Cicero's comments divide the quotations from Pacuvius into five groups.³⁷ The first four groups are written in anapaestic quaternarii with a paroemiac concluding the fourth group. Despite smaller omissions the verses connect and belong to an exchange between Odysseus and those who carry him on stage. These attendants seem to have formed the chorus of the tragedy.³⁸ The last quotation from the tragedy's final scene is written in trochaic septenarii.

When commenting on the verses from *Niptra*, Cicero makes three claims which influence the way in which the quotations are understood. Firstly, he emphasizes that Pacuvius' wounded Odysseus does not lament too much. Secondly, he observes that Pacuvius deviates in this regard from Sophocles' portrayal of the hero. By pointing out that Odysseus regained his composure, though his pain had not ceased, Cicero lastly suggests that Pacuvius presented the hero as an example that is to be emulated. The picture that emerges from Cicero's discussion of the scene can be described as follows: Pacuvius adapted and changed a Sophoclean tragedy, turning the tragic hero into an *exemplum virtutis*.

In the light of Cicero's comments, the passage from Pacuvius' *Niptra* has come to be considered as an example of the moralizing tendencies of Roman tragedy.³⁹ It has, moreover, been suggested that ethical instruction lay at the heart of Pacuvius' play.⁴⁰ His tragedy would thus almost comply with the conception of the theatre as a moral institution as articulated by Lessing and Schiller. Roman playwrights undoubtedly had to change the Greek tragedies

37 Schierl (2006: 412–14) on fr. 199 (256–267 R³) and fr. 200 (268–269 R³).

38 Discussing this passage Hose (1998: 127–29) points out that the Roman chorus was unlike the chorus of Greek tragedy involved in the stage play.

39 So, for example, Peglau (2000: 154), who regards the passage as “ein außergewöhnlich eindrucksvolles und eindeutiges Beispiel für Romanisierung oder Moralisierung des griechischen Originals [. . .].”

40 Baier (2000: 298) argues that the tragic subject matter was transformed into an “ethisches Lehrstück”.

they adapted in order to appeal to the Roman audience and to conform with the conventions of the Roman stage.⁴¹ A transformation of the wailing hero of Sophocles into an exemplary character would be in line with this overall picture. Before jumping to conclusions about Pacuvius' play, however, it seems advisable to ask what share Cicero has in the construction of this *exemplum virtutis*. After all he (i.e. the persona he adopts in the discussions) emphatically sets himself up as a teacher in moral matters and brings the didactic concern of the *Tusculans* to the fore.⁴²

To define his contribution it is necessary to separate as far as possible what Pacuvius wrote from Cicero's reading. Cicero selects suitable verses, takes them out of their original context and weaves them into his own argument. Being embedded in the *Tusculans* the verses quoted from Pacuvius are charged with new meaning. In quoting Cicero is thus appropriating Pacuvius' verses.⁴³ Besides, there is a significant difference between citing a verse or two and citing and commenting on a cluster of quotations. When adducing the exchange between Odysseus and his attendants and evoking the situational context, Cicero is indeed staging and re-enacting a scene of the play, however short it is. His comments thereby direct the readers' reception of the verses he quotes. Interwoven with his comments the quotations become an integral part of Cicero's treatise. Nevertheless, there remains a palpable tension between the quoted verses and their new textual environment.

In the remainder of this chapter I shall first discuss obvious discrepancies between Cicero's comments and the anapaests featuring Odysseus' lament. Next I seek to show how meaning is generated as verses from different parts of the tragedy are put side by side. Special attention will be given to the way in which Cicero sells his "abridged" version of Odysseus' end. The discussion of his portrayal of the Roman playwright will finally lead me to reconsider the *Niptra*-passage in the light of the literary aims of the *Tusculans*.

41 Manuwald (2011: 133–37); on the *Niptra*, cf. Manuwald (2003: 85–86); on the chorus, cf. Hose (1998).

42 Cicero's assumption of this role which contrasts with the avoidance of didacticism in previous dialogues is explained by Gildenhard (2007: 28–34, 63–78) who reads the *Tusculans* as a dialogue that enacts "his vision of Latin philosophy as a means and medium of political protest, public outreach and cultural warfare" (63).

43 On a basic definition of the term "quotation" that has influenced recent research on Cicero, cf. Spahlinger (2005: 9–30, esp. 24) and the contributions on Cicero in Tischer/Bitternagel (2010).

4 Odysseus' Lament

In his comments on the anapaests Cicero emphasizes in no less than three instances the moderation of Pacuvius' Odysseus. He introduces the verses from *Niptra* with the words: "[...] he does not lament too much—or rather moderately." Then he contrasts Pacuvius' hero with the wailing Odysseus of Sophocles and reasserts his initial claim when he refers to Pacuvius' Odysseus as "slightly groaning". Finally he puts his lament into perspective by pointing out that he does not lament "excessively in his great pain".

Are we to accept Cicero's reading? Some scholars have pointed to discrepancies between his comments and Pacuvius' verses, and I seek to reinforce their observations.⁴⁴ Reading the anapaests without Cicero's comments, we would hardly get the impression of moderation. After all Odysseus cries out in pain, urging those who carry him to be more careful. In this way he prompts them to remind him of his former steadfastness. Their rebuke is a natural reaction to the lament of Odysseus. In the light of Cicero's emphasis on the hero's restraint, however, the intervention of the attendants seems out of place. To explain their rebuke Cicero points out that they act in consideration of Odysseus' dignity: *personae gravitatem intuentes*. Yet it is arguably Cicero's focus on the moderation of the hero that complicates the situation and necessitates this justification of their behaviour in the first place.

What is more, the exhortation of the attendants is of no avail, since Odysseus subsequently screams out overwhelmed by pain: "Oh how I suffer! I am in agony!" Cicero dismisses this cry as a temporary loss of control when he remarks: "He begins to lose grip, then stops immediately." He thus concedes the hero's break-down and downplays it at the same time by anticipating the moment in which he falls silent. Even if the lament should have ended with the words *saevum amplificatis dolorem*, Odysseus has at this moment not yet gained control of himself. The anapaests rather convey the following picture: Odysseus accuses those who carry him of increasing his pain, they exhort him, and he finally sends them away.⁴⁵ Unless we take the final quotation in trochaic septenarii into consideration, there is no sign that Odysseus manages to overcome pain.

44 Both La Penna (1979: 79–80), and Perutelli (2006: 4–5), observe that Cicero's use of the quotations is tendentious.

45 La Penna (1979: 80) comments: "Ulisse rinuncia a farsi trasportare perché non può resistere al dolore provocato dalle scosse, anche se i portatori agiscono con la massima delicatezza."

5 The Hero's Last Words

The anapaests analysed above neither attest to Odysseus' moderation nor do they show any development towards a final triumph over pain. Following the anapaests, Cicero quotes two trochaic septenarii spoken by the dying hero. Odysseus has now regained his composure and even exhorts others to endure adverse fortune: "It is seemly to deplore ill fortune but not to bewail it: that is a man's duty; weeping is bestowed on women's natures." With the reference *in extremis Niptris* Cicero indicates that the trochaic septenarii come from the very end of Pacuvius' tragedy. By quoting them together with the anapaests, he downplays the focus on adverse fortune and creates the impression that physical pain is still at stake.

As Cicero puts verses from different scenes side by side a possibly substantial part of the tragedy is eclipsed. Instructive is a comparison with the *exodos* of Sophocles' *Trachiniae* (971–1278) from which Cicero translated Heracles' speech of lament at *Tusculanae disputationes* 2.20. As a tragedy that foregrounds intense pain the *Trachiniae* provide a parallel to *Niptra* in more than one respect.⁴⁶ Two thirds into the play Heracles is carried on stage, poisoned by the garment imbued with the blood of Nessus. Between the anapaests accompanying his arrival and the tragedy's ending lie about three hundred verses. They contain the hero's speech of lament and a conversation with his son Hyllus in which Heracles is informed about the suicide of his wife and gives final injunctions to his son, commanding above all to be burnt on Oeta. In Pacuvius' *Niptra* the focus may in a similar way have shifted away from physical pain as the plot moved forward; this is especially probable, if it was only later discovered that Odysseus was killed by his son Telegonus.⁴⁷ Even though the lack of evidence does not allow for a reliable reconstruction of the play's ending, it is conceivable that the reason for lament changed and that Cicero suppresses the context in which *fortuna adversa* originally appeared in Pacuvius to make the quoted verses suit his own argument.⁴⁸

46 We have, of course, to allow for structural differences between a Greek and a Roman tragedy, especially if Pacuvius should indeed have combined two Sophoclean plays in his *Niptra*.

47 On this possibility, cf. also Manuwald (2003: 88–89 with n. 84) with reference to Ribbeck.

48 Cicero's focus on the hero's exemplarity leads Baier (2000: 294) to assume that the death of Odysseus at the hands of his son was not as essential for the Roman tragedy as for the Greek: "Wenn der griechische Odysseus jammert, wie Cicero es ihm vorwirft, dann beklagt er nicht so sehr seine Verwundung als eben diese tragische Verkettung. In der Situation, die Sohn und Vater zusammenführt, ohne dass sie sich erkennen, liegt, jedenfalls im Urteil des Aristoteles, die Tragik. Cicero, und man muß vermuten: auch Pacuvius,

The reason why these quotations from different parts of the tragedy can be related to each other in the first place is that they raise the question of the right form and intensity of lament. In the trochaic septenarii *conqueri* and *lamentari* are used to contrast a moderate lament as befits a man with unrestrained weeping denounced as effeminate.⁴⁹ Cicero deploys the key term *lamentari* repeatedly in his comments on the anapaests. When Pacuvius' Odysseus contrasts different forms of lament and uses this term, he appears to distance himself from his previous behaviour. In interweaving the verses from two different scenes of the play, Cicero suggests that the hero undergoes a development: He manages to overcome pain and becomes an example for others to imitate.

In order to show an Odysseus who conquers physical pain, Cicero seems to gloss over differences between the quotations. However, the passage may serve an additional function within the larger context of the philosophical argument. Already when turning to discuss *ratio* at *Tusculanae disputationes* 2.43, Cicero points out that enduring pain is a feature of brave and great-spirited men. He regards the correct dispositions of the mind (*rectae animi adfectiones*) as being inextricably linked with each other and subordinate to *virtus*, after which they are all commonly called virtues. On this basis he argues at the end of book 2 that those who pursue honour will not only be able to endure pain, but will also learn to bear adverse fortune: "For if we do everything in order to avoid moral badness and achieve honour, we shall be able to despise not only the stabs of pain, but also the thunderbolts of Fortune."⁵⁰ This claim is anticipated by the quotations from Pacuvius which likewise connect bearing pain and adverse fortune.

6 Constructing an *exemplum virtutis*: Cicero's Rhetorical Strategies

It is worth having a closer look at the way in which Cicero moves from the hero's lament to his last words. Cicero introduces the last section of the anapaests with the remark: "He begins to lose grip, then stops immediately." In this way he suggests that Odysseus stopped lamenting once he had sent away those who carried him. Although there is no indication that the hero managed

kommt es darauf nicht an. Dieses im griechischen Stück zentrale tragische Verhängnis spielt für den Römer überhaupt keine Rolle."

49 On the contrast of synonyms, cf. Garbarino (1973: 11, 615–16).

50 *Tusc.* 2.66 *Nam si omnia fugiendae turpitudinis adipiscendaeque honestatis causa faciemus, non modo stimulos doloris, sed etiam fulmina fortunae contemnamus licebit...*; for the translation, cf. Douglas (1990: 55).

to contain his pain, this is what Cicero insinuates with the following leading question: “Do you see how he has fallen silent? The pain of the body has not been soothed, but checked in the mind by a rebuke.”⁵¹

Videsne (“do you see?”) is used repeatedly in *Tusculans* 2 to introduce questions that draw attention to points of special importance.⁵² In the present case *videsne*, moreover, functions as a verbal cue to imagine the scene,⁵³ ascribing the role of an eye-witness to the interlocutor, and so to the reader. *Videsne* shows that the audience—whether internal or external—is made to visualize the lament of Odysseus. Rather than presenting his own interpretation of the events, Cicero confronts them with the scene and authorizes them in this way to draw themselves the conclusion that Odysseus has fallen silent because he has overcome pain. At the crucial moment of transition, when the connection between the anapaestic section and Odysseus’ final statement could be called into question, Cicero seemingly stands back and enjoins the audience to reach a conclusion on the basis of “what they see”. By quoting from and commenting on the verses of Pacuvius, Cicero re-enacts the scene of lament and brings it before the mind’s eye of the listener or reader. Put in the place of an eye-witness, the audience may evaluate Odysseus’ behaviour for themselves. Harnessing in this way their power of imagination Cicero resorts to *evidentia*⁵⁴ as a means of persuasion.⁵⁵ The address of the interlocutor serves thus to gloss

51 Pohlenz (1918), Giusta (1984) and Douglas (1990: 46–47). put the question mark after *dolor*, and Douglas translates: “Do you see how what has fallen silent is not a physical pain which has been soothed, but a mental one which has been checked by a rebuke?” Cf. also the translation of Grilli (1987: 153). However, Odysseus is more likely to be the subject of *obmutuerit*, since Cicero comments on his reactions before and after this sentence (e.g. *incipit labi, desinit and obiurgat*); for this reason I put the question mark after *obmutuerit* and take the phrase *non sedatus—dolor* (with an ellipsis of *est*) as an epexegetical comment explaining why he has fallen silent. I punctuate accordingly: *Videsne ut obmutuerit? Non sedatus corporis, sed castigatus animi dolor*. On the use of the genitive, cf. Hofmann-Szantyr (1972: 75).

52 *Tusc.* 2.14, 26, 27, 53.

53 On verbal cues to imagine in Cicero’s forensic oratory, cf. Innocenti (1994: 374–75).

54 On definitions of *evidentia* or ἐνάργεια, cf. Lausberg (1999: 399–407); Webb (2009: 87–106). *Evidentia* is usually associated with vivid descriptions, but Webb (2009: 105) justly points out: “*Enargeia* is [...] far more than a figure of speech, or a purely linguistic phenomenon. It is a quality of language that derives from something beyond words: the capacity to visualize a scene. And its effect also goes beyond words in that it sparks a corresponding image, with corresponding emotional associations, in the mind of the listener.”

55 Webb (2009: 89–90, 98–102) discusses the way in which a vivid account engages the audience in the events described and arouses corresponding emotions; on *evidentia* as a means to create a suggestion of truth (in early modern literature), cf. Müller (2007: 65–66).

over the interface between the quotations. At the same time Cicero downplays his own role as creator of this “abridged” version of Odysseus’ lament, which merges in fact two different sections of Pacuvius’ play.

7 Pacuvius as an Authority in Moral Matters

Cicero does not merely interpret Pacuvius’ verses in line with his own argument, but ascribes to the poet an insight into the mastery of pain. In his comment on the attendants’ rebuke Cicero seizes on the phrase *qui consuetus in armis* and praises Pacuvius for understanding that *consuetudo*, that is regular exposure to pain, may teach endurance: “The poet sensibly realises that the habit of bearing pain is a teacher not to be despised.” By relating the quotation to his central thesis that *consuetudo* and *ratio* provide means of overcoming pain, Cicero creates the impression that Pacuvius anticipated the argument of the *Tusculans*. In so doing he attributes to the poet the role of an authority in moral matters. However, the reference to Odysseus’ experiences under arms does not necessarily presuppose Pacuvius’ insight into the doctrine expounded by Cicero, but may simply convey the attendants’ surprise. A similar contrast between past and present behaviour of a hero can be found in Heracles’ lament in Sophocles’ *Trachiniae* and suggests that the reference to past endurance constitutes a conventional element in speeches of lament.⁵⁶

The Odysseus who undergoes a development towards *virtus perfecta* results in no small measure from Cicero’s mise-en-scène of the verses he quotes. Nevertheless, it is, of course, Pacuvius who ultimately provides the basis for his portrayal of the hero. At the end of the tragedy, when Odysseus has evidently regained stature, he imparts the lesson on bearing adverse fortune in trochaic septenarii. Maxims (*sententiae*) of this kind are a typical feature of Greco-Roman drama, especially of Euripides’ tragedies, of New Comedy and Republican drama. The relation between fortune and virtue seems to have been a preferred topic in Roman tragedy.⁵⁷ A comparable saying is quoted by Nonius from Accius’ *Meleager* (460 R³; 512 Dang.): *Erat istuc virile, ferre advorsam fortunam facul*.⁵⁸ In Terence’s *Phormio* (138–139) a grandiloquent slave strikes a

56 Soph. *Trach.* 1071–1073; Cicero translates the passage at *Tusc.* 2.21: *Heu virginalem me ore ploratum edere, / quem vidit nemo ulli ingemescentem malo!* Sophocles’ Heracles increases the plaintive tone of his speech by lamenting his very lament. Pacuvius, by contrast, seems to reduce Odysseus’ lament by attributing the rebuke to the chorus.

57 Scafoglio (2010: 161, 179–80).

58 Warmington (1957: 477 on Accius fr. 440) translates: “That was a manly thing—to bear bad fortune easily.” For a discussion of the context, cf. Scafoglio (2010: 165–66).

heroic pose with a similar proclamation. Keeping one's composure in the face of adverse fortune is each time described as a manly quality. All passages draw on the notion that *virtus* is derived from *vir*, on which Cicero (*Tusculanae disputationes* 2.43) also comments when he embarks on the discussion of reason, pointing to (courage) *fortitudo* as characteristic manly quality that stands behind the etymological link.⁵⁹ The sayings have thus a distinctly Roman tinge, even though the idea that changing fortune has to be born with equanimity is not as such Roman, but can likewise be found in Greek drama.⁶⁰

The maxim that is voiced by the dying Odysseus lies at the heart of Cicero's reading of the *Niptra*. Pacuvius' tragedy seems to have ended with a memorable scene which focused on a truly heroic character and is likely to have found the appeal of the Roman audience. There is, however, hardly enough evidence to draw any conclusions on Pacuvius' didactic intent⁶¹ or to determine to what extent ethical concerns shaped the whole play.

8 From Greece to Rome: *Pacuvius hoc melius quam Sophocles*

Cicero presents Pacuvius as a moral authority, but he has, as I have argued, a fair share in the creation of the *exemplum virtutis*. What is more, he suggests that the exemplary hero is a genuinely Roman product when he compares Pacuvius' Odysseus, who laments moderately, to his wailing Sophoclean counterpart. His comparison is not substantiated by quotations from Sophocles. Nevertheless, even readers who were not familiar with the Sophoclean tragedy that dealt with the end of Odysseus, would have had an idea of what a wailing hero of Sophocles was like. For the comparison of Pacuvius and Sophocles points back to *Tusculanae disputationes* 2.20–22 where Cicero translates Heracles' speech of lament from Sophocles' *Trachiniae*. As observed above, this passage is adduced alongside the laments of Philoctetes and Prometheus to illustrate the power of pain. Prompted by the question of his interlocutor who is not familiar with the cited verses, Cicero explains that he translated them from the Greek himself. Sophocles' *Trachiniae* and Aeschylus' *Prometheus Unbound* were, as far as we know, not adapted by Republican playwrights. Accius had written a *Philocteta*,

59 On the syllogism, cf. Grilli (1987: 313–14). He also points out that in Greek ἀνὴρ (“man”) and ἀνδρεία (“courage”) rather than ἀρετή (“virtue”) are directly related.

60 For a parallel in New Comedy, cf. Men. *Dysk.* 769–770. Scafoglio (2010: 165–66). relates Accius' maxim to a Greco-Roman concept of heroism that precedes philosophical thought.

61 On the rhetorical and dramatic function of Euripidean gnomes, cf. Most (2003: 150–51, 154).

but is not mentioned in this context;⁶² thus, it could seem that Cicero goes even in this case back to a tragedy of Sophocles. In claiming that he had to translate the long laments of Heracles and Prometheus, Cicero fosters the impression that wailing heroes are characteristic of Greek rather than Roman tragedy. His comparison of Pacuvius' and Sophocles' Odysseus later confirms this impression. Throughout the discussion of pain in book 2, Cicero thus works with and intertwines two dichotomous pairs: Greek / Roman, lament / endurance.

It may be true that Republican playwrights avoided extensive laments so that Heracles' speech in the *Trachiniae* did not find an equivalent in Republican tragedy. When evaluating Cicero's statements on the representation of lament in Pacuvius and Sophocles, we have to bear in mind, however, that the audience's expectations or questions of staging may likewise have played a role alongside the putative ethical concerns of Pacuvius which are foregrounded by Cicero.

The translations from Greek tragedy in the first half of the book, where Cicero rejects wrong attitudes towards pain, are balanced by extensive quotations from Ennius and Pacuvius in the second half. The latter provide positive examples and serve to illustrate how *consuetudo* and *ratio* respectively may help to endure pain.⁶³ The clusters of quotations from Greek and Roman tragedy thus punctuate the argument. Used in this way the quotations become an integral part of Cicero's work and establish the contrast between Greece and Rome at another level. In the discussion on pain Cicero ultimately continues the rhetoric of Rome's superiority over Greece that shapes above all the prefaces in which he justifies his own undertaking of developing a *philosophia Latina*.⁶⁴

In summary it can be said that in quoting from and commenting on Pacuvius' *Niptra* Cicero presents the "Roman" Odysseus as a role-model and emphasizes moral aspects of the tragedy. Moreover, he praises Pacuvius as a *poeta prudens* who anticipates some of the teachings on pain expounded in book 2. As he sets out to create a philosophical literature in Latin, turning to an area of study where Greece had as yet not been challenged by Rome, Cicero points to the wisdom of previous generations of Romans. The comparison of Pacuvius and Sophocles forms part of this discourse as the playwright Pacuvius is turned into an illustration of Rome's innate excellence in practical ethics.

62 The quotations (552–553, 562–565 R³) are usually ascribed to Accius' *Philocteta*. Cicero quotes from this tragedy in other works and refers explicitly to Accius as the author.

63 On the difference between Greek and Roman poets, cf. Michel (1983: 449).

64 Gildenhard (2007: 89–206, esp. 90–91, 132–43); cf., for example, *Tusc.* 1.1 ... *sed meum semper iudicium fuit omnia nostros aut invenisse per se sapientius quam Graecos aut accepta ab illis fecisse meliora* ...

240 BCE and All That: The Romanness of Republican Tragedy

Robert Cowan

atqui hic Livius primus fabulam C. Claudio Caeci filio et M. Tuditano consulibus docuit.

CICERO, *Brutus* 72.

The first date in English History is 55 BC, in which year Julius Caesar (the memorable Roman Emperor) landed, like all other successful invaders of these islands, at Thanet.

This was in the Olden Days, when the Romans were top nation on account of their classical education, etc.

SELLAR and YATEMAN, 1066 and *All That*

Roman tragedy began in 240 BC, which was rather late. This was not Rome's first encounter with Greek culture; the two had been well acquainted for five centuries, through contact with the cities of Magna Graecia and other parts of the Greek world.¹ Nor was it the beginning of drama at Rome; though the details are as controversial now as they evidently were at least as early as the Late Republic, at least some form of indigenous, Etruscan or Oscan performance tradition had long been in place.² Yet it is not merely the ancient love for fixing a start point, ideally with a named *πρῶτος εὐρετής*, which prompted Cicero to specify this date (though the convenient (near-)synchronism with the birth of Ennius does prompt scepticism).³ Something changed and something was new in 240 BCE, when Rome simultaneously established an empire (making Sicily its first colony following victory in the First Punic War) and a

1 On finds of Greek pottery in Rome dating to the eighth century, cf. La Rocca (1977). For Rome and Magna Graecia in the later period, from 350 onwards, cf. esp. Lomas (1993).

2 The *locus classicus* is Livy's controversial account (7.2) of the institution of *ludi scaenici* in the form of non-mimetic dancing imported from Etruria, on which see most recently and conveniently Manuwald (2011) 30–4, with references to earlier discussions at 30 n. 67. For a wide-ranging discussion of Italian theatre, indigenous and otherwise, including *fabulae Atellanae*, cf. Rawson (1985a).

3 Cic. *Brut.* 72 continues: *anno ipso ante quam natus est Ennius*.

literature.⁴ It is far beyond the scope of what will in any case be a compressed discussion to address the fraught issues surrounding ‘the invention of Latin literature’, but it will be clear that my sympathies lie very much with Feeney’s emphasis on the discontinuity, the exceptionality, and, as he puts it, the “contingency” of Rome’s wholesale appropriation of Greek tragedy, comedy, epic and other genres.⁵ My focus will rather be on an equally difficult question: what was Roman about Republican tragedy.

This single question raises countless others, not only about the specifics of Rome’s engagement with Greek culture, but more generally about what it means for a genre to have a national identity. Not only what was Roman about Republican tragedy, but what does it mean for it to *be* Roman. A typical comment is that of Cancik, that “[t]he subject-matter of Roman tragedy is the myth of the Greeks [...] This subject-matter is altered, in part ‘Romanized’ by contemporary politics, religion and philosophy.”⁶ Indeed, the search for the Roman in Roman tragedy is most clearly exemplified by various articles entitled “*Römisches in . . .*” but all too few interrogate whether the inclusion of “Roman elements” in itself constitutes “Romanness.”⁷ Often the language used to characterize the Roman engagement with “superior” Greek originals is bedevilled with notions of “secondariness”, “pale imitation” and even “incompetence”. Such assumptions occasionally lead to lapses of memory, as when Ennius is accused of “interfering” with Euripides’ *Iphigenia at Aulis* by changing the Euripidean chorus of soldiers into a less appropriate one of young girls.⁸ It is, of course, Euripides whose chorus is of young women, Ennius of soldiers. More often, Republican tragedy is assumed to have offered simplistically moralizing and patriotic banalizations of complex Greek originals.⁹

4 I use “literature” throughout as a convenient shorthand for poetry (including drama) and prose genres (primarily historiography), without wishing to assert any primacy of writing over performance, or indeed of assuming that a precise conceptual category corresponding to the modern word existed in Graeco-Roman antiquity. For excellent discussion, cf. Goldberg (2005).

5 Feeney (2005); other important, if divergent, studies on this question include Gruen (1990: 79–123), Zorzetti (1991), Habinek (1998: 34–68 and 2005), and Manuwald (2011: 15–40).

6 Cancik (1978: 330): “Der Stoff der römischen Tragödie ist der Mythos der Griechen, . . . Dieser Stoff wird modifiziert, z. T. ‘romanisiert’ durch die zeitgenössische römische Politik, Religion und Philosophie.”

7 Accius’ *Telephus*: Stockert (2002); Ennius’ *Hectoris Lytra*: Faller (2008); cf. Faller (2000) on Ennius’ *Iphigenia* (“Romanisierungstendenzen”).

8 Gratwick (1982: 136).

9 E.g. Holford-Strevens (2000: 222) on the alleged “compulsion to make [Sophocles] conform to the self-conscious *virtus* of the *mos maiorum* or of Stoicism” as when Pacuvius’ Ulysses in the *Niptra* “pulls himself together to depart this life with a maxim worthy of a scoutmaster.”

Other critics, largely in reaction to such a narrative of change and decline, strive to forge explicit connections between what we know or can speculate about Republican tragedy and its historical context. As with readings of Attic tragedy which see a Pericles behind every Oedipus or an Alcibiades behind every Philoctetes, typological interpretations are particularly common.¹⁰ With rather more subtlety, but no less distortion of the evidence, every connection with the Trojan War is interpreted as being motivated by Rome's myth of Trojan origins, despite the frequency of Trojan War plays in Attic tragedy, the doubtful prominence of Rome's Trojan origins in the Middle Republic, and above all the tangential relationship to Troy of the many *nostos* plays which are often counted among the alleged preponderance of such tragedies, sometimes extending even to the next generation of Orestes.¹¹ Such attempts to contextualize Republican tragedy are admirable in principle, but a degree of caution and of subtlety is needed, especially owing to the paucity of evidence.

As with every other aspect of Republican tragedy, attempts to judge its Romanness are severely hampered by a lack of evidence. No complete script survives, no single fragment is longer than twelve lines and, though reconstructions can tentatively be attempted using Hyginus' *Fabulae*, there is nothing comparable to the (relatively) secure evidence of ancient hypotheses of Attic tragedies.¹² Testimonia, both for the plots and especially for performance conditions, are late and sparse, mainly concentrated in the tendentious works of Cicero, who often had his own conscious or unconscious agenda for shaping the reception of earlier tragedy. The scanty evidence is generally supplemented by and structured around three useful but problematic comparative models, about which evidence is more abundant. Fifth-century Attic drama, the probable model of much Republican tragedy (though lost fourth-century and Hellenistic intermediaries are also important), offers a particularly suggestive comparand, both in its probable differences and similarities. Much caution is necessary, of course, but I shall nevertheless make considerable use of recent developments in scholarship on Attic tragedy and its diaspora to suggest possible avenues of approach for the study of Republican tragedy. At the very least, the Athenianness and more broadly the Greekness of Attic tragedy offers an independent model for how such dramas could function within and outside the societies which produced and re-performed them. Yet it would be an extreme position to argue that there was no relationship whatsoever

10 Cf. nn. 85 and 90 below.

11 Cf. e.g. Lefèvre (1990: 11–14); Weber (2000) is more judicious.

12 On the use of Hyginus: Schierl (2006: 22–25); cf. Huys (1996–1997) on Hyginus and Euripides. For a cautionary note on Greek hypotheses: Brown (1987).

between the Greekness (or otherwise) of Greek tragedy and the Romanness (or otherwise) of Rome's reception of Greek tragedy.

The complete scripts of Republican comedy offer perhaps the richest and most promising evidence for the contemporary tragic tradition, but generic differences should not be underestimated.¹³ The self-conscious play with ethnic identity and scenic space, so prominent in Plautus, is by no means unthinkable in his contemporary Ennius, but such more-or-less explicit, ludic self-reflexivity is undeniably more a feature of comedy than of tragedy.¹⁴ Moreover, the (primarily) domestic nature of New Comedy, both Greek and Roman, makes it inherently more suited to transference between cultures, focusing as it generally does on universal human situations.¹⁵ However, while this distinguishes it from the topicality of Old Comedy, mythological tragedy, though unquestionably having the potential for contemporary relevance, had arguably as great a potential for deracinated multi-application. Every city might have its crafty slave and lecherous old man, but every city could also be equally close and distant to the pan-Hellenic, pan-Mediterranean myths of Troy and Thebes. Finally, there is the Late Republican testimony, almost entirely Ciceronian, for the reception, re-use and re-performance of Mid-Republican tragedy.¹⁶ Since Republican tragedy was itself a reception, re-use and re-performance of Attic and Hellenistic tragedy, this evidence may be more useful and in a somewhat different way than is often thought, but it still cannot be used as direct testimony for performance practice and context during a period between two centuries and fifty years earlier.

In this chapter, I shall have space to do no more than sketch some possible avenues of approach, including some relatively unexplored ones. Recent work on Attic tragedy has increasingly focused on its spread throughout the Greek world, from Sicilian and Macedonian tyrants commissioning plays by Aeschylus and Euripides in the fifth century to the widespread re-performance of tragedies premiered at the Dionysia or Lenaea, beginning in the fifth and increasing in the following centuries. I shall try to situate Republican tragedy

13 Cf. Slater in this volume.

14 For Athens: Taplin (1986); for Rome: Moore (1998: 67–90), Sharrock (2009). Implicit tragic self-consciousness is widely argued for both in Athens, e.g., Dobrov (2001), Torrance (2013) and in Rome, e.g., Erasmo (2004), and Boyle (2006).

15 A generalization, of course, and on the politics of Greek and Roman New Comedy, cf. e.g. Lape (2004), Leigh (2004), Owens (2011).

16 On re-performance: Beacham (1991: 156–63), Champlin (2003: 295–305), Erasmo (2004: 81–101), and Boyle (2006: 143–59). On literary and rhetorical reception: Goldberg (2000b and 2005: 115–43), Cowan (2013b). On the dangers of reading Republican tragedy through Cicero, cf. Schierl in this volume and also Zetzel (2007).

in the context of that diaspora, considering in particular to what extent it is (merely?) a part of it, and to what extent it stands outside as a peculiarly Roman phenomenon. From contemporary context, we move to a comparative model, applying techniques used in post-colonial and transnational literary criticism to think about the almost unique situation whereby a politically dominant society appropriated the culture of one it was in the process of conquering, and arguably invented *Weltliteratur* by deracinating Greek literature from the Greek culture in which it was embedded. We shall then move to a closer focus on (what survives of) the plays themselves, and how they might—self-consciously or incidentally—reflect or problematize their own Romanness: language, which is the main feature which clearly distinguishes Republican tragedy from all other known (ancient) instances of the tragic diaspora, and identity, the ways in which audiences might have been encouraged to see themselves or “the Other” on the stage before them.

1 Republican Tragedy as Part of the Tragic Diaspora

It is tempting—and the temptation should not perhaps be entirely resisted—to measure the Romanness of Republican tragedy against the Athenianness of fifth-century Attic tragedy, specifically its close relationship to democratic ideology, as emphasized by the dominant mode of late twentieth- and early twenty-first century scholarship.¹⁷ A recent study even went so far as to draw up a table comparing the features which embedded Attic tragedy within its society with those which kept Republican tragedy insulated from it.¹⁸ The difficulties and dangers of comparing fifth-century Athens with mid-Republican Rome, especially with regard to their tragic performances, is one that we must constantly bear in mind, though without rejecting its potential value out of hand. At least, as noted above, Attic drama can offer a neutral parallel, but what that parallel is has in recent years been problematized by a reaction against the notion that tragedy was inextricably bound up with Athenian democracy. Part of that reaction has been reactionary rather than reactive, looking to reverse the process of historicization and return the study—or perhaps better the appreciation—of tragedy to a question of subjective aesthetics and eternal

17 The bibliography is immense, but particularly influential works, with differing emphases, are Vernant and Vidal-Naquet (1986), Meier (1988), Goldhill (1990), Seaford (1994); a useful recent survey is Carter (2007).

18 Gildenhard (2010: 165).

verities about the ahistorical human condition.¹⁹ However, more suggestive work has developed rather than undoing the historicization of tragedy, arguing for the applicability of tragic ideology to wider Greek ideals rather than narrowly Athenian ones. Perhaps most influentially, Rhodes, with reference not only to tragedy but even to Old Comedy, sees “Athenian drama as reflecting the *polis* in general rather than the democratic *polis* in particular.”²⁰

This chapter is not the place to debate in any detail the question of whether Attic tragedy had anything to do with democracy, but Rhodes’ formulation has obvious implications for the question of the Romanness of Republican tragedy. To see Attic tragedy as “reflecting the *polis* in general” does not make it less Athenian, but only less *peculiarly* Athenian, making it susceptible of “reflecting” the values and ideology of whichever *polis* appropriates and performs it. Rome certainly appropriated and performed Attic tragedy in the third and second centuries, and, on the basis of Rhodes’ argument, it could be seen to make Livius’ and Pacuvius’ *fabulae* “Roman” in an analogous way to that in which Aeschylus’ and Euripides’ τραγωδαίαι were “Athenian”. At least it could if Rome were a *polis*, or wanted to construct itself as one. This in itself is a major question about Rome, and one with its own further implications for Republican tragedy: did Rome’s importation of tragedy constitute a gesture claiming Hellenism, putting on plays which were part of its cultural heritage like any other *polis* in the Greek world, or did the genre and the institution of staging it remain marked as alien and imported, Roman only inasmuch as it was culturally translated? This question is central to the whole issue of the Romanness of Republican tragedy and we shall only approach even a provisional answer in the conclusion. However, it does lead us to consider a further aspect of the way in which Athenian tragedy was not exclusively Athenian: the enormously successful export of tragedy beyond Athens and the different political significance which it must have had when performed in non-democratic, non-Ionian *poleis*.

The immense popularity of tragedy across the Greek world, and its rapid spread, have been the subject of considerable recent study, but Republican tragedy has very rarely been included in such discussions.²¹ Even if we do not entirely accept Rhodes’ claim that Athenian drama was not peculiarly Athenian when performed in Athens, any democratic ideology encoded in the

19 Notably Griffin (1998) and (1999).

20 Rhodes (2003: 119).

21 Cf. esp. Allan (2001), Csapo (2010: 83–116), chapters in Bosher (2012) and in section C of Csapo et al. (2014). Nervegna (2014: 177–87) does make a significant move to relate Rome to the tragic diaspora.

plays seems not to have been sufficient to make them unpalatable in *poleis* with very different political and ethnic identities. The extent to which even the most apparently Athenian of plays could be meaningfully performed in what might seem the least Ionian, least democratic of *poleis* can be shown by the (probable) staging of one of the most pro-Athenian, anti-Spartan of tragedies, Euripides' *Children of Heracles*, in a Dorian *polis* in Magna Graecia, Heraclea.²² As Allan puts it, "the (political) impact of tragedy is affected by the place of its performance" and "[w]hile it would be obtuse to deny the pro-Athenian factor in such plays as *The Children of Heracles*, their transplantation to Greek communities well beyond Attica will have brought different dramatic (and ideological) elements to the fore."²³ Again, the relevance to Rome is clear. I have elsewhere compared the performance of Roman tragedy to Borges' Pierre Menard, whose word-for-word 'writing' of *Don Quixote*, though identical to Cervantes' original, had a totally different meaning because it was 'composed' in the twentieth rather than the seventeenth century.²⁴ Even a verbatim, gesture-for-gesture re-performance of a play as it was staged at the Great Dionysia would have a different meaning when performed in Dorian Heraclea or non-Greek Rome, and it would have the potential to be, with its new accrual of meaning, just as "Heracleian" or "Roman" as the original was "Athenian". This is a powerful model, and it is important to recognize the extent to which Republican tragedy can be situated within the wider practice of the re-performance of tragedy. Yet it is also important to recognize the limits of such a model, to remember the distinctive qualities of Republican tragedy—especially its language and the non-Greek ethnicity of its audience—and their implications for its Romanness.

The re-performance of Attic tragedies in other parts of the Greek world offers one analogy for the Roman tragedies, if we conceptualize them as "re-performances" (after translation and transformation) of plays based on Attic originals. However, even if we think of them as new plays written for a non-Athenian audience, though in the Athenian genre (which is in one sense the case for all Republican tragedy, most clearly for plays without a known Attic precedent, such as Pacuvius' *Iliona* or Accius' *Epinausimache*), there remains a parallel in tragedies written by Athenians for non-Athenian and distinctly non-democratic audiences. Both Aeschylus and Euripides wrote tragedies

22 The case for such a performance is made by Allan (2001: esp. 73–79) principally on the basis of a concentration in the area of pottery depicting scenes from the play.

23 Allan (2001: 80).

24 Cowan (2010: 42–43). I reiterate my debt to Martindale's (1993: 85–86) use of the short story to illustrate theories of translation.

commissioned by tyrants, the former in Sicily, the latter in Macedon. As with re-performances, performance context is key, but with specially commissioned plays it is the poets as well as the audience who are affected. *The Children of Heracles* may take on a less pro-Athenian, anti-Spartan colour when staged and watched in Dorian Heraclea, but for all that meaning is generated at the point of reception, few would be so committed to reader- (or audience-) response theory as to dispute that the composition of a text has a considerable impact as well. Despite their very fragmentary state, there is ample evidence of how *Aetnaeae* and *Archelaus* were written to reflect and serve the ideological ends of their authors' patrons. Euripides' *Archelaus* offered a Greek aetiology for the Macedonian dynasty that included the eponymous hero's homonymous descendant. As such, both the act of performing any tragedy at all and the specific subject-matter of the play in question reinforced Macedonian claims to Hellenic identity, as well as the claim to power of the ruling house.²⁵ Aeschylus' *Aetnaeae* celebrated Hieron's "foundation" of the city of Aetna and gave it a cosmic dimension through Zeus' imposition, through rape, of (masculine, Hellenizing) order upon (feminine, indigenous) chaos embodied in the nymph Thaleia.²⁶ As Duncan eloquently argues:

the tragedies that Aeschylus and Euripides wrote and produced for tyrants at the edges of the Greek world were not aberrations from democratic ideology, or "experiments", or exceptions that proved the rule; they were early indicators of the tremendous influence that performance context, of any ideological stripe, exerted on tragic poets.²⁷

The parallel with Republican tragedy is here even closer, since, whatever ideological ends we think Livius and his successors were serving, it seems clear that tragedy as a genre was flexible enough to accommodate it.

The precedents of Sicily and Macedon suggest the potential for Republican tragedy quite easily to be fully "Roman", just as *Aetnaeae* was Sicilian and *Archelaus* Macedonian, though it does tend to make the radical appropriation of Attic tragedy a less peculiarly Roman act. However, this is to overlook the crucial issue of Hellenism, which remains in both fifth-century plays, even if they lack a recognizable Athenian quality. Allan connects both kinds of tragic performance outside Athens, arguing that:

²⁵ Revermann (1999–2000), Di Giuseppe (2004), Katsouris (2005).

²⁶ Cataudella (1962), Herington (1967), Dougherty (1991), Poli-Palladini (2001), Duncan (2010), Seminara (2009).

²⁷ Duncan (2011: 84).

The crucial factor in Megale Hellas was theatre's role in *affirming Greek identity*. Patrons like Hieron in the west (and Archelaus in the north) recognized and exploited both the panhellenic appeal of tragedy and its potential as a vehicle of Hellenization.²⁸

Here we come to a crucial question whose answer has considerable importance for the Romanness of Republican tragedy. How far was it, despite its linguistic, cultural and institutional transformations, a claim to Hellenism, and how far was it an assertion of a Roman identity that could appropriate Greek culture without being subsumed within it? To approach this question, other models will be needed.

2 Republican Tragedy between Imperial, Postcolonial and Transnational Literature

Postcolonial criticism has been one of the major movements in literary studies (as well as in other disciplines) for several decades now, and its impact on Classical studies has been felt, particularly in work on constructions of “the Other” and, conversely, on constructions of the Self by those under Imperial rule, such as the Greeks of the Second Sophistic.²⁹ In particular, the reception of Classical texts, above all performances and versions of Greek tragedy, in modern postcolonial cultures has been an increasingly fertile field of study.³⁰ Such studies tend either to deconstruct imperial or colonial cultures’ construction of the colonized subject and the power relations between them, to find the “subaltern voice” within colonial systems, or to analyse the ways in which postcolonial societies engage with indigenous traditions and colonial impositions to regenerate or create a cultural identity.³¹ How might such an approach (or set of approaches) illuminate Republican tragedy? As Hose argued, in a

28 Emphasis is that of Allan (2001: 69). He does partially qualify this claim at 86 n. 76: “one should also stress that the affirmation of Greek identity is not the whole story of tragedy in southern Italy: we need only consider the popularity of tragic myth in non-Greek communities”.

29 Examples include Hall (1989), Burton (1995), Habinek (1998: 151–69), Whitmarsh (2001), Lewis (2010), and Bowditch (2011).

30 E.g. articles in Goff (2005), esp. Budelmann on West African versions of Greek tragedy, Hardwick and Gillespie (2007), and Goff and Simpson (2007).

31 The literature is vast, and the methodologies varied, so that it is better now to talk of plural postcolonialisms. A (relatively) recent survey can be found in Chew and Richards (2010).

wonderfully provocative article, the postcolonial model of the colonized having to use the cultural structures of the colonizers fits Rome's use of Greek genres extremely well, but with the crucial difference that Rome was (at least from the start of the second century, and arguably well before) the colonizing power, with the military and political might.³² Hose's solution to this paradoxical conundrum relies too much on the myth of the Trojan origin of Rome, but the issues he raises are important and stimulating, and have considerable potential for throwing light, not only on the specific relationship of Greece and Rome, but on the complex dynamics which can pertain between societies whose political and cultural inequalities are not weighted on the same side.

Roman appropriation of Greek culture can be seen to combine features of colonized and colonizing literature.³³ Horace's famous paradox that *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit* remains a suggestive summation of the complex relationship.³⁴ Republican tragedy shares with the writing of colonized peoples the limitations of expressing itself using the expressive forms of a culturally dominant society, the classic example of which is Shakespeare's Caliban, who can only express his opposition to Prospero using Prospero's own language.³⁵ Yet the Romans do not use the Greek language (early historiography is the exception), and in this sense the *postcolonial* assertion of cultural identity through "nation language" is prefigured here.³⁶ Indeed, the perspective can even be reversed and Rome's forcing of Greek tragedy into her own language (especially by "domesticating" translation; discussed below pp. 75–77) can be seen as an imperial move re-conceptualizing colonized culture in the linguistic and thought-system of the colonizer.³⁷ I shall turn to the issue of language in more detail shortly, but the very production of Roman "versions" of Greek tragedy has intriguing parallels with the controversial issue of "rewriting". Here in particular the conflicting positions in postcolonial criticism correspond to the paradoxical relationship of Greek and Roman culture. When colonial or postcolonial authors (re)write versions of canonical works of the colonizing culture, the act can be constructed as one of subversive appropriation, but also of one which reinforces the centrality of the colonizing culture, since any

32 Hose (1999).

33 This is a brief sketch of an approach I plan to develop fully elsewhere.

34 Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.156, cited by Hose (1999: 306), and Cowan (2010: 39).

35 E.g., Greenblatt (1976), and Cheyfitz (1991). Ashcroft (2009) argues for ways in which the colonized can appropriate the colonizer's language.

36 Nation-language: Brathwaite (1984), and Thiong'o (1986).

37 Again, cf. Greenblatt (1976), and an interesting application of his ideas to Aeschylus' *Aetneae* in Dougherty (1991).

dialogue is played out on its territory.³⁸ The similarity to the dynamic whereby Rome aggressively appropriates Greek tragedy but in the very act of doing so implicitly acknowledges the latter's iconic canonicity is clear.

Another important factor to be taken into account when considering the "identity" of Republican tragedy is the "identity" of the men (for they were all men) who wrote them. The formation of any cultural artefact is shaped by various influences, including the artist, the demands or at least presumed expectations of the commissioner, and the nature of the audience. This nexus of influences is particularly prominent in Republican drama, with its power-differential between generally low-status authors (and performers) and elite magistrates, and its especial reliance on popular success to secure future contracts.³⁹ We should by no means, therefore, look for an unmediated perspective on the tragedians' worldview through their plays, but neither should we elide their role in the creative process altogether. Livius Andronicus was from the city of Tarentum in Magna Graecia, and his very name, blending Roman and Greek, suggests that of a Greek slave freed to be enrolled in a Roman gens. Ennius was a Messapian who famously claimed to have three hearts because he spoke the three languages of Latin, Greek and Oscan.⁴⁰ Even Accius seems to have been the son of a freedman in the newly-founded colony of Pisaurum. As such they stand in an almost parallel relationship with the tragedies they composed, partaking of an identity which was both Roman and non-Roman, or perhaps neither. The postcolonial concept of hybridity is particularly useful here.⁴¹ The complex status of writers from colonized societies (and their writings), who are to a greater or lesser extent assimilated by the colonizing culture, but maintain an identity which may be dual or even liminal, is applicable to many of the Roman authors throughout Republic and Empire with two *patriae*, but perhaps especially so to these early figures from recently colonized areas.

Closely related to postcolonial criticism is the field of transnationalism and world literature. Taking its origins in Goethe's famous notion of *Weltliteratur*,

38 Rewriting: Thieme (2001), Mooneeram (2006), and Mukherjee (2014).

39 As George Harrison reminds me, the dynamic may have been further complicated by cases where a figure of relatively high status in his native community was brought to Rome as a prisoner-of-war or under similar circumstances which gave him lower status there.

40 *Quintus Ennius tria corda habere sese dicebat, quod loqui Graece et Osce et Latine sciret.* Gell. 17.17.1, with Gowers (2007).

41 Hybridity: Bhabha (1994), Young (1995), Khair (2001), and Andall and Duncan (2010). There is a suggestive application of hybridity to Renaissance English literature in Schmidt (2013).

transnationalism (or, again, different transnationalisms) looks at the ways in which texts, partly in their composition, but especially in their reception, transcend national boundaries, in a way which also serves to deconstruct both colonial and postcolonial identities.⁴² Increasingly, transnationalism in literature is bound up with wider economic and social issues of globalization, and the question of whether so-called globalization simply occludes the neo-imperial hegemony of major Western powers, in particular the USA.⁴³ The transnational lens is a particularly suggestive one through which to look at Republican tragedy and especially its Romanness. On one level, the deracination of Greek tragedy from its cultural context and even its language rendered it a prototypical *Weltliteratur*, the common property of all peoples and all cultures.⁴⁴ Against this is the extent to which tragedy was actively and aggressively “Romanized” which would suggest that it was taken away from Greek culture not to be offered to the nations as *Weltliteratur*, but to be appropriated and become *Roman* literature. Alternatively, one might blur the distinction between the two positions, seeing the internationalizing of tragedy as part of Rome’s imperial ambitions to make *urbs* and *orbis* coextensive, globalization as imperialism, *Weltliteratur* as national literature.

3 Language, Translation and Wordplay

It is the language of Republican tragedy which most clearly sets it apart from all other known instances of the diffusion of Attic tragedy, and which perhaps constitutes its clearest mark of Romanness. It is all too easy to think of this move as an obvious or even natural one, after over two millennia of cultural translation and vernacular appropriation, but its strangeness and perhaps even uniqueness must be acknowledged in order fully to appreciate its implications. As Feeney notes, “on the available evidence, no society in the ancient world other than the Romans took over the prototypical forms of the institution of Greek literature as the basis for a corresponding institution in their own vernacular.”⁴⁵ The decision to perform (and of course compose) drama in the vernacular as opposed to in the “original” is always a culturally significant one, as with modern decisions to sing opera in, say, the English or Italian of the

42 Transnationalism: Damrosch (2003), Ramazani (2009), and Jay (2010).

43 For a wide-ranging discussion of globalization and literature, cf. Gupta (2009).

44 Cf. Damrosch (2003: 6): “A work enters into world literature . . . by circulating out into a broader world beyond its linguistic and cultural point of origin.”

45 Feeney (2005: 230).

audience rather than the librettist's German, Czech or Russian. Yet it becomes more significant when the very notion of translation is not an obvious alternative, and might even be an unprecedented innovation. Even then it can seem banally unremarkable and, again, 'natural' for Latin 'equivalents' to be found which would make Greek words and concepts 'comprehensible' to a Roman audience. However, the decision to *make* such words and concepts comprehensible, to 'domesticate' them rather than retaining their foreign alterity, the decision as to *what* constitutes an equivalent in the transaction not only between languages but between cultures, these decisions are not natural or obvious but carry considerable cultural and ideological weight.⁴⁶ This, moreover, in cases of apparently very 'close' translation, quite apart from instances where, at points on a spectrum rather than as a polar alternative, 'translations' seem more like 'changes', and others where the very issue of linguistic and cultural difference is self-consciously foregrounded. In this section, we shall look briefly at what the burgeoning discipline of Translation Studies has to offer for our question, before looking at examples of the way in which the tension between (Romanizing) domestication and (Hellenizing) foreignization is played out, and sometimes self-consciously reflected upon.⁴⁷

The contrast between "domesticating" and "foreignizing" translations was developed by Venuti, building on the early nineteenth century work of Friedrich Schleiermacher, and has become an important issue in Translation Studies.⁴⁸ Venuti himself acknowledges that the terms refer to areas on a spectrum rather than polar opposites, but the contrast between them remains marked. "Domesticating" translations elide the cultural and linguistic differences of the source text and the culture which generated it, placing greater emphasis on finding words, terms and concepts which are more "at home" in the target language and culture. "Foreignizing" translations retain elements from the source language and culture which might seem unidiomatic or alien in the target culture, and thus retain a sense of alterity and foreignness. Using the suggestive metaphor of spatial travel, Venuti sets the contrast up as between "bringing the author back home, and [...] sending the reader abroad."⁴⁹

46 For the cultural significance of the subtle differences between the prologues of Euripides' *Medea* and Ennius' *Medea Exul*, cf. Gildenhardt (2010: 173–75), and Cowan (2010: 43–44).

47 Much of the scholarship on Republican tragedy deals, directly or indirectly, with issues of 'translation', broadly or narrowly conceived, but the most extensive and important studies are Traina (1970: 113–65 on Ennius and 181–203 on Accius), and Lennartz (1994). Gildenhardt (2010: 172–79) makes interesting use of methodologies from translation studies.

48 Venuti (1995 and 1998), citing Schleiermacher's 1813 lecture from Lefevere (1977: 74).

49 Venuti (1995: 20).

The distinction has implications beyond the linguistic and has considerable importance within the “cultural turn” which Translation Studies has taken, and particularly its engagement with Postcolonialism. Venuti himself uses forceful language to depict foreignizing translation as “a strategic cultural intervention in the current state of world affairs, pitched against the hegemonic English-language nations and the unequal cultural exchanges in which they engage their global others.”⁵⁰ Caution is needed in mapping such a relationship between the cultures of Early Modern and Modern European colonial (and postcolonial) powers and the colonized cultures of Africa, South America, India, and elsewhere, onto the rather different relationship between Roman and Greek cultures in the mid-Republican, mid-Hellenistic period. However, the choice between domesticating and foreignizing translation retains its power to establish a relationship of appropriation and domination, or of assimilation and cooperation. In crude and simplistic terms, did the Romans take Greek tragedy and make it Roman, or did their assimilation of Greek tragedy contribute to the Hellenization of their own culture?

The issue can be seen played out on the level of morphology in the choice of whether to use Greek or Latinizing forms of names. The vagaries of transmission make it difficult to be quite sure whether a given ending is the original poet’s or a normalization by a later scribe or scholar.⁵¹ However, Varro preserves an interesting insight, not only on the divergence of Republican tragedians’ practice, but on their self-consciousness about that practice. Accius, in polemical correction of his predecessors’ practice, insisted on using Greek accusatives instead of Latinizing ones, and his insistence on this was even memorialized in a poem by Soranus.⁵² Such a self-conscious move in both theory and practice again situates Republican tragedy in the world of the scholar-poets of the Hellenistic period, and is particularly characteristic of Accius, who wrote not only tragedies, but theoretical works on drama, the *Didascalica* and *Pragmatica*, including criticism of Euripides’ choral lyric.⁵³ Yet such scholarly controversies were not—or not merely—ends in themselves. Rather, they show tragedians reflecting, always in practice and in Accius’ case also in theory, on what tragedy should be, and specifically what Roman tragedy

50 Venuti (1995: 20).

51 Adams (2003: 371–73).

52 *itaque Ennius ait: ‘Hectoris natum de Troiano muro iactari’* (fr. 100 R³). *Accius haec in tra-goediis largius a prisca consuetudine movere coepit et ad formas graecas verborum magis revocare, [et] a quo Valerius ait: ‘Accius Hectorem nollet facere, Hectora mallet’* (Q. Valerius [Soranus] fr. 1 Courtney). Varr. *L.* 10.70.

53 Acc. *Didasc.* fr. 11 Morel.

should be.⁵⁴ Ennius' use of the form *Crespontem* and Pacuvius' of *Helenam* are domesticating—on a microcosmic scale, to be sure, but for that very reason the more revealing—bringing Greek tragedy to Rome, overtly making it Roman and eliding its Greekness, making even Greek names Latin.⁵⁵ In contrast, Accius' *Perseu* is foreignizing, carrying the audience to Greece or at least emphasizing that it is a Greek artifact which has been carried to them.⁵⁶ Adams contrasts the role of Greek forms in Latin private inscriptions commissioned by Greeks, which “contributes to the identity of the referent” with that in Latin poets who “were probably more interested in using the sounds and inflections of Greek to evoke an exotic world”, but, quite apart from the fact that Livius and Ennius at least were as much Greek-speakers as Latin-speakers, the construction of identity and the evocation of the exotic are, in the context of Republican tragedy, the same thing.⁵⁷ Accius' foreignizing rendering of Greek names gives a Greek, exotic, alien identity both to the characters bearing those names and to the genre which they inhabit. He makes tragedy less Roman by emphasizing his Greekness, but his insistence on maintaining its Greekness while presenting it in a Roman context is in itself, perhaps paradoxically, quintessentially Roman.

Bilingual wordplay is another particularly suggestive site for the negotiation of linguistic and cultural identity and alterity. Once more we are indebted to Varro for preserving two examples in which Ennius reproduces from Euripides the etymologizing of a Greek name which only makes sense in Greek (*De lingua latina* 7.82). Indeed Varro criticizes Ennius for a “slip” (*lapsus*) in both instances, though we should not rule out the possibility of irony in his assessment. The first is the etymology of Andromache from ἀνδρὶ μάχεσθαι, “to fight a man” which can most plausibly be assigned to the *Andromacha Aichmalotis* (Ennius 99R³).⁵⁸

54 On Accius' play with language, cf. esp. Bagordo (2002).

55 Enn. *Cresph.* fr. 114–117 R³; 125–131 Joc, but rejected by Vahlen and Warmington, and *adesp.* fr. 5 *TrRF*). The text is uncertain, but the shift from φ to unaspirated p would have a similar effect. Pacuv. *Iliona* fr. 150 Schierl (also Warmington and D'Anna, but *adesp.* fr. 80–82 R³; 26 *TrRF*); cf. Adams (2003: 372 n. 142): “those early poets who persistently Latinized such names might have been motivated by a sort of linguistic nationalism.”

56 Acc. *Andromeda* fr. 116 R³. Accius' practice may have been inconsistent or scribal error may have introduced Latinizing forms, on which cf. Adams (2003: 371). Some editors (on the authority of Varro) emend manuscript readings to “restore” Hellenizing forms, such as *Hectora* at *Epinaus*. fr. 160 Dangel (= *inc. fab.* f 667 R³, reading *Hectorem*).

57 Adams (2003: 372).

58 To avoid clutter, all fragments of Republican tragedy are given according to the numeration of Ribbeck' third edition (R³). Warmington's Loeb's, Jocelyn's Ennius and Schierl's Pacuvius all have useful concordances, though Dangel's Accius unhelpfully offers only one list based on her numeration. The numbering of the new *Tragicorum Fragmenta*

Andromachae nomen qui indidit recte indidit.

He who gave her name to Andromache gave it rightly.

The second is surely from the *Alexander*, and deals with the etymology of Paris' alternative name, Alexandros, from ἀλεξήσας ('having taken care of [the flocks]'; Ennius *Alexandros* fr. 64 R³):

quapropter Parim pastores nunc Alexandrum uocant.

For that reason the herdsmen now call Paris Alexander.

Varro asserts that both etymologies were present in Euripides, and for the latter we have the independent testimony of Pseudo-Apollodorus.⁵⁹ Unfortunately, he does not preserve the etymologies themselves, but it is clear not only from his assertion, but from the phrasing of the Ennian lines (esp. *quapropter*) that Ennius must have given a Latin equivalent of the calque, such as *cum viro pugnare* and *pecus curavit*. Varro is surely wrong to see Ennius as making a mistake, but right to identify a striking decision by the tragedian to open up a linguistic gap which he could easily have avoided. For these bilingual etymologies, quite apart from being instances of Hellenistic doctrina appropriate to a Hellenistic poet, simultaneously domesticate and foreignize Euripides' original.⁶⁰ They domesticate inasmuch as they draw no distinction between Greek and Latin, almost code-switching as they treat the Greek names as if they were Roman and did indeed recognizably derive from Latin words which ostensibly etymologize them. Yet at the same time, the aural dissonance whereby Andromache patently *does not* derive from *cum viro pugnare* draws attention to the linguistic and cultural gap across which Ennius is bringing Euripides' tragedy, while the sub-echo of ἄνδρι μάχειν, resonating in the ears of Greek speakers, virtually dramatizes the act of translation. The paradox of the linguistic effect has

Romanorum (TrRF) will doubtless become standard, but at the time of writing, only volumes 1 (Livius, Naevius, *minores* and *adespota*) and 2 (Ennius) have been published, and it seemed preferable not to have a separate system for Pacuvius and Accius. Translations are my own.

59 αὐθις Ἀλέξανδρος προσωνομάσθη, ληστὰς ἀμυνόμενος καὶ τοῖς ποιμνίοις ἀλεξήσας. Apollod. 3.12.5 = Eur. *Alex.* 42d TrGF. Apollodorus does not mention Euripides, but the triangulation with Varro's Ennius is strongly suggestive. The Andromache etymology is also Eur. *inc. fab.* 1094 TrGF.

60 Hellenistic Ennius: Wuelfing von Martitz (1971); *contra* Goldberg (1995: 90–92).

equally paradoxical implications for the Romanness of the play. By conjuring the Greek words behind the translation, Ennius reminds his audience that this was originally a Greek play, but by supplanting those Greek words with their Latin equivalents, he also reminds them that it is no longer Greek, but has been rendered Roman. As a final thought on these two fragments, it may be significant that both characters are not actually Greek, but Trojan.⁶¹ We need not lay excessive and potentially anachronistic stress on the Trojan origins of Rome, but there is added piquancy in the appropriation of Greek names which could be plausibly imagined as Greek appropriations of originally Trojan or Mysian names. Ennius may be self-consciously imitating Greek practice as well as Greek originals.

Much more could be said about the cultural politics of Republican tragic language, in particular the formation of its own *Kunstsprache* which neither corresponded to Greek nor was familiarly Roman but rather, with its archaisms, coinages and compounds, produced a complex blend of defamiliarizing distance from contemporary speech and recognizable markers of Roman rather than Greek discourse.⁶² However, to conclude this brief outline of possible avenues of approach, I would like to remain with the issue of self-consciousness and observe how the tragedies themselves foregrounded questions of language and linguistic identity. Speech is, of course, one of the fundamental features of drama, and one which sets it apart from narrative poetry. As such, self-referential discussion of the role of speech, its potency and its unreliability, was—as far as the limited remains can show—as pervasive as in the extant scripts of Attic tragedy. The remains of Pacuvius' tragedies seem to show a particular preoccupation with the slipperiness of language, as Ellis has subtly argued.⁶³ In one very famous line, this self-consciousness extends to the issue of linguistic identity (Pacuvius *Chryses* f 89 R³):

id quod nostri caelum memorant, Grai perhibent aethera.

That which our people call sky, the Greeks speak of as *aether*.

61 Andromache is only Trojan by marriage, but still non-Greek, from Thebe in Mysia/Cilicia (Hom. *Il.* 6.395–397).

62 The standard commentaries of Jocelyn, Dangel and Schierl have good discussions of language and style. For Accius, cf. also Casaceli (1976).

63 Ellis (2005: 120): "The difficulties of articulation are central to plot themes of deception and revelation and Pacuvius' language probes the very twists of the psyche, mirroring and twisting its internality out into the action of the plays."

Cicero, or more precisely Balbus, the Stoic interlocutor in his dialogue *De natura deorum*, points to the absurdity of this line, even anticipating an objection in its defence, “as if indeed it were not a Greek who was saying this. ‘But,’ you will say, ‘he is speaking Latin.’ as if we were not listening to him as if he were speaking Greek.”⁶⁴ If Balbus is correct about the identity of the speaker, this is a striking rupture of what may tentatively be called the dramatic illusion, as the words are spoken in the ethnic and linguistic identity of the actor on the stage (and the audience in the *cavea*) rather than of the character in the world of the play, a transgression more characteristic of comedy than of tragedy. If he is also correct that the tacit assumption of the audience is that tragic characters, though of course speaking Latin, are to be thought of as speaking Greek, this line would both violate and draw attention to its violation of that convention. Certainly the other line of Pacuvius which he proceeds to quote, *Graiukena: de isto aperit ipsa oratio* (“Of Greek birth: my/your/his very speech is revelatory about that.” *inc. fab.* fr. 364 R³), must involve some pressure on the dramatic illusion. The softest version would be one where a character is being reported as speaking Greek (perhaps offstage in a messenger speech) but then presumably speaking Latin onstage, but it could be that a character claims to be speaking Greek (and using that as an indicator of identity) *while speaking Latin*.

To return to Pacuvius *Chryses* fr. 89 R³, however, it is far from certain that Cicero (or Balbus) is correct in his assertion, either that the character speaking is Greek or that the audience would, by willing suspension of disbelief, assume that all the characters were to be imagined as speaking Greek. It may be that either Cicero himself has nodded, or he is tendentiously characterizing his interlocutor as doing so. In any case, the line is of particular interest if, as is the scholarly consensus, it is assigned to the *Chryses*. This play, whether imitating Sophocles’ play of the same name or, as is apparently the case with *Iliona* and *Medus*, a plot of Pacuvius’ own invention, can be seen as a sequel to Euripides (and perhaps Naevius’) *Iphigenia in Tauris*.⁶⁵ Fleeing the pursuing Thoas and the Taurians, Iphigenia, Orestes and Pylades come to Chryse, whose king Chryses is ultimately recognized as the son of Chryseis and, not Apollo as she had claimed, but Agamemnon. Like many of Pacuvius’ plays, it has identity as a central theme, but, unlike in *Atalanta*, *Iliona*, *Medus*, or *Dulorestes*, the

64 *quasi vero non Graius hoc dicat. ‘at Latine loquitur.’ si quidem nos non quasi Graece loquentem audiamus.* Cic. *De nat. deorum* 2.91.

65 On Pacuvius *Chryses*, cf. esp. Slater (2000). On Sophocles’ play and its relationship to Eur. *IT*: Marshall (2009).

identity here is ethnic as well as personal and familial.⁶⁶ Chryses' *anagnorisis* reveals him not only as the son of Agamemnon and half-brother of Orestes and Iphigenia, but as (at least half-)Greek, a paradox of identity most poignantly expressed in his assertion that "rightly did my father [Agamemnon] sack my fatherland [Chryse]".⁶⁷ If the speaker of fr. 89 was a pre-recognition Chryses, then his barbarian language is represented by Latin in antithesis to the marked Greek word *aether*, and likewise his and the audience's barbarian identity set in antithesis to Greek identity. If Pacuvius' play were based on a Sophoclean original (in Greek, of course), the shift would be even more marked, but whatever the tragedy's provenance, its eponymous hero stands as a metaphor for the dual identity of this and, by extension, all Republican tragedy. Language is only one, but an unarguably important one, of the means by which that identity is both constructed and interrogated.

4 Identity, Religion, Space and Aetiology

I turn now from the narrow focus of language to the broader issue of identity, which has been the object of much of the most interesting work on Republican tragedy in the last fifteen years.⁶⁸ It is useful to draw, with caution, a distinction between the implications of the *institutional* dimension of how the staging of tragedy was framed, and indeed the decision to stage it at all, and the *content* of the dramas themselves. Of course, there will very often—perhaps, to some degree, always—be some overlap between the two. To compare Attic tragedy once again, one need only think of Sophocles' *Ajax*, where the effect of the *institutional* pre-performance parade of war-orphans in their state-funded panoplies resonates with the play's *content*, specifically the issue of what is to become of Ajax's orphaned son Eurysaces.⁶⁹ Likewise, it is conceivable that a Roman audience-member who "felt" somewhat Greek by virtue of watching a tragedy might as a result respond in particular ways to the depiction of Greek and other characters within the play. Yet the two categories are sufficiently distinct for it to be worth looking at them separately before discussing their potential overlap.

In all that follows, it is important not to imagine a homogenous audience or even a single response within relatively homogenous sections of that

66 Identity in Pacuvius: Slater (2000), Fantham (2003), and Manuwald (2003: 43–54).

67 *atque, ut promeruit, pater mihi patriam populavit meam*, fr. 79 R³, with Slater (2000).

68 Notably the studies in Manuwald (2000), Faller (2001) and Faller and Manuwald (2002).

69 Goldhill (1990: 117–18); the objections by Finglass (2011: 305) are not compelling.

audience. Pelling skilfully demonstrates how Euripides' *Medea* might have produced different reactions even among Athenian citizens in the audience, quite apart from metics and non-Athenians visiting the Dionysia.⁷⁰ The probable audience for the various *ludi* at Rome would, if anything, have been even more diverse and even its citizen body would lack the narrow sense of exclusive, autochthonous identity which must have existed at Athens, at least after Pericles' citizenship laws.⁷¹ None of which is to say that plays cannot construct an *implied* audience and even attempt to produce, rather than simply respond to, a community through the emotional responses it encourages. However, caution must be observed.

We have already seen how the staging of Attic tragedy outside Attica and especially on the periphery of the unambiguously Greek world, in the West, in Macedonia, and in the various contact zones of the successor kingdoms, constituted at least in part a claim to Hellenism and Hellenic identity. To what extent did the institution of performing tragedy at Rome constitute a similar claim? Bearing in mind always the important issue of language, at which we have already glanced, I shall here look briefly at only three of the key issues: religion, aetiology and space. Greek drama was performed in a ritual context which, at least in its original Athenian incarnation, bound it closely to the *polis*. Roman drama was also performed in a ritual context, at *ludi* offered to various gods.⁷² However, the emphasis at these *ludi* was on innovation and importation, and also on success in war, whether celebrated or requested. The great age of Republican tragedy (and comedy) coincides unsurprisingly with the massive expansion both of *ludi* and of Rome's empire. The first tragedy, of course, celebrated victory in the First Punic War. Later plays were performed at new games such as the *ludi Apollinares* (from 212 BCE) and *Megalenses* (204 BCE). The latter is particularly significant as it was associated with the introduction of the cult of the Magna Mater to Rome. There is considerable risk of oversimplification, but the association of Republican tragedy with conquest, with the importation of cult, and more generally with innovation fits with a model whereby the plays themselves had to retain a degree of "foreignness" in order to fulfil their function as the fruits of conquest, the objects of importation and appropriation. Republican tragedy did not forge a cultural link with Hellenism by assimilating itself to other instantiations of the tragic

70 Pelling (2000: 199–200).

71 On the audience of Republican drama (focusing on comedy, but equally applicable to tragedy), cf. Goldberg (1998, esp. 12–16), and Manuwald (2011: 98–108).

72 On the festival, political and religious context of *ludi scaenici*, cf. Boyle (2006) 13–16 and Manuwald (2011) 41–55, with references to earlier scholarship.

diaspora either through a full sense of Greekness or by fully naturalizing itself at Rome. Rather, it stamped marks of Roman appropriation on something whose residual Greekness set itself apart as something to be objectified and regarded from the outside.

The famous temporary theatres of Rome contributed further to this distancing. To be sure, in Athens, the theatre of Dionysus during the Dionysia was set apart as special festival time and space, but it remained permanently embedded in the heart of the *polis*. By contrast, the wooden stages of Republican drama, set up like offerings in the precincts of the temples of Cybele and Apollo, rendered the plays enacted on them importations offered to the gods and displayed to the people, so far from being embedded in the physical and conceptual space of the *urbs* as to leave no trace between *ludi*. Space, of a different kind, precludes the more nuanced picture which this topic demands, but I hope to have shown one way in which tragedy's Greekness could be maintained, but as an object of conquest which preserved Rome's distinct identity rather than as a shared element within a common Hellenism.

Turning from the institutional dimension to tragedies' content, the temptation should be resisted to draw too stark a contrast between a presumed identification felt by Athenian audiences towards Greek tragic characters, and a likewise presumed disconnect between Roman audiences and those they see onstage. Almost all Attic tragedy is set in non-Athenian space and in heroic time, and this combines with a complex interplay of anachronism and anti-quarianism to produce an equally complex interplay of identification and alienation. Zeitlin's analysis of tragic Thebes as a *locus* for identification and alterity, which is both Self and Other to Athens, is probably the most influential such interpretation, though she still puts much emphasis on the degree of identification.⁷³ Allan and Kelly have recently pushed the notion further to emphasize the role of "heroic distance and heroic difference" in circumscribing the extent to which audiences at the Dionysia might be tempted to identify the self-destructive, monarchical dystopias onstage with their contemporary, Athenian, democratic society.⁷⁴ It is notable that the handful of tragedies set in Attica—Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, Euripides' *Suppliant Women*, *Children of Heracles* and *Erechtheus*, Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*—tend to offer a strongly positive depiction of Athens and, while some have detected troubling undertones in the depiction of Theseus and Demophon in the second and third of these, even this can at least partly be accounted for by the

73 Zeitlin (1990).

74 Allan and Kelly (2013: 99–112), quoting from 100, but removing the original italics. On anachronism in Attic tragedy: Easterling (1985).

temporal dimension of heroic distance and the constitutional heroic difference of monarchy.⁷⁵ The notion that the Attic tragic chorus acts as a sort of surrogate for the citizen audience, a surrogacy reinforced by the citizen status of the choreuts and by the centrality of choreia in civic life, has also been convincingly challenged, notably by Gould, who argues that the predominantly marginal (female, elderly, and/or non-Greek) identity of the choruses means that they offer an “‘otherness’ of experience [which] is indeed tied to its being the experience of a “community” but that community is not that of the sovereign, (adult, male) citizen-body.”⁷⁶

Approached in these terms, it is not *prima facie* more likely that a Roman audience would feel a greater or lesser degree of identification with a Theban or Argive character onstage than would an Athenian. Inasmuch as characters represent a different city, with a different constitution, temporally separate, they are Other, and as for the fact that they are Greek, while it might work in concert with other tokens of alterity, there is no evidence that it was a significant factor in itself. Arguments from silence are always dangerous, especially when the silence is as great as that surrounding the few surviving sound bites of Republican tragedy, yet it is interesting that, in contrast to the numerous attacks on seers in the surviving fragments, there is no stereotypical criticism of the behaviour or characteristics of Greeks comparable to Attic tragedy’s criticism of barbarians or even of Roman comedy’s self-conscious use of pejorative terms such as *pergraecari* ostensibly by Greek characters.⁷⁷ It is important also to consider the opposite possibility, that the Romans whose language Plautus could, with whatever degree of irony, call *barbarus* might feel identification with non-Greek characters on stage, both being set in opposition to Greeks. We have already seen a possible example when Pacuvius may have had a barbarian (perhaps Chryses) refer to *nostri* using a Latin word in antithesis to Greeks using a Greek equivalent. Cases have been made for the identification of Romans with their supposed Trojan ancestors as represented in tragedy, but evidence of this from the plays is hard to find, in particular anything which

75 Theseus’ status as a paradoxically democratic king (Eur. *Supp.* 403–5) is a further complication, on which cf. Mills (1997: 97–104).

76 Gould (1996), quoting from 224. The opposing case for chorus-audience identification, most sophisticatedly represented by Henrichs’ (1994–1995) argument from choral self-referentiality, continues to be made and the debate continues, notably in Dhuga (2011). On the Republican tragic chorus: Hose (1998).

77 Seers: Enn. *Telamo* fr. 269–76 R³, *inc.* fr. 364, Pac. *Chryses* fr. 83–5 R³, Acc. *Astyanax* fr. 169–70 R³. Barbarians in Attic tragedy: e.g. Soph. *Tereus* fr. 587 TrGF, Eur. *Andr.* 243 *et saepe*, *Hcl.* 423–4, *IA* 1274–5 with Hall (1989); *pergraecari*: Plaut. *Bacch.* 813 (*congraeicare* at 743), *Most.* 22, 64, 960, *Poen.* 603, *Truc.* 8.

might distinguish Roman practice from the often sympathetic depiction of Trojans in Attic tragedy, and in any case it is not entirely clear how prominent the myth of Trojan origins was at this stage.⁷⁸

In any consideration of identification and difference between audience and spectacle, the issue of space is crucial. I have already suggested that the temporary nature of Republican (at least pre-55 BC) stages tended to discourage identification between the dramas performed on them and the everyday physical space of Rome. This is one case where the institutional and performative dimensions of tragedy substantially overlap, for the temporary stages also impact upon the audience's perception of the acting space as either part of the city or part of the world of the play. Important here is the distinction between environmental and scenic space, that in which the actors and audience are actually located and that in which the characters are notionally situated.⁷⁹ There are interesting examples in Attic tragedy of how the tension, or sometimes the harmony, between scenic and environmental space can be manipulated, perhaps most strikingly in the conclusion of Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, when the torch-light procession leaves by the eisodos and continues on into the city.⁸⁰ Of course, the second half of *Eumenides* is set in Athens, so the dissonance between scenic and environmental space is much less. Indeed, another interesting dynamic must have been operative in plays such as Ennius' *Eumenides* and *Erechtheus*, where an Athenian depiction of Athenian space could have been transformed either into Athens as cypher for Rome, or an alien Athens viewed from Rome.⁸¹

In Plautine comedy, full advantage is taken of this disjuncture, introducing Roman landmarks into a notional Athens, and, most famously and explicitly, in *Curculio*, inviting the audience to look at actual (environmental) landmarks visible from the Forum.⁸² This ludic treatment of space is an integral part of Plautus' manipulation of the tension between Romanness and Greekness in his characters, his setting and his comedies themselves, but as ever comedy's greater licence for self-referentiality means that we should be cautious before

78 On the Trojan myth at Rome before the Iulii, see the cautionary arguments of Erskine (2001: 23–43).

79 For an excellent discussion of environmental and scenic space in Old Comedy, cf. Revermann (2006: 107–29).

80 Revermann (2006: 116–17).

81 On these plays, cf. esp. Zimmermann (2000).

82 E.g. the Porta Trigemina at *Capt.* 90. *Curc.* 466–486, though the metatheatrical figure of the choragus, almost akin to a prologue-speaker, makes the anatopisms less jarring. On this topic in general, cf. esp. Dixon (2010). On Plautine blurring of Greek and Roman more generally, cf. Moore (1998: 50–66).

extrapolating similar moves in tragedy. Indeed, one line may conceivably show a tragedian carefully policing the boundary between scenic and environmental space, and simultaneously that between audience and characters. Cicero preserves a senarius by Naevius to illustrate poets' tolerance of hiatus (Naevius 62 R³):

vos qui adcolitis Histrum fluvium atque algidam

You who live beside the river Ister and the icy . . .

Though Cicero does not specify which play he is quoting, most critics have agreed with Ribbeck's suggestion that it is from the *Iphigenia at Taurus* and related to Thoas' call to pursue Iphigenia, Orestes and Pylades: ὦ πάντες ἄστοι τῆσδε βαρβάρου χθονός (Oh all you citizens of this barbarian land, Euripides *IT* 1422).⁸³ The Euripidean Thoas' reference to his own land as "barbarian" is itself a striking moment of self-consciousness, blurring the focalization of character and audience, but carefully demarcating the environmental space of the Theatre of Dionysus from the scenic, deictic space of the land of Taurians.⁸⁴ The danger of confusing scenic and environmental space was, of course, far greater in Rome where a Hellenizing tragedy referring to "this barbarian land" could indeed be taken as meaning Rome. Whether or not Naevius is specifically responding to Euripides' own sophisticated manipulation of spatial referents, he can be seen to be carefully avoiding having his audience be drawn into thinking of Rome as the barbarian land of the Taurians and hence themselves as the barbarian subjects of Thoas. This is not to say that this boundary was always so policed, and homogeneity should be no more imposed upon Republican tragedians, or even their individual tragedies, than upon the audience. Yet it does strongly suggest a sensitivity, comparable with that of Plautus, to the impact which construction of space can have on construction of identity.

I have hitherto laid most emphasis on the tendency against identification between audience and characters, but this is by no means the whole picture. Fifth-century Athens once more provides a suggestive point of comparison. Whatever one thinks of ultimately unprovable allegorical and typological interpretations, Attic tragedy does unquestionably forge a link between the heroic past and the democratic present by means of aetiology and especially

83 Cic. *Orat.* 152. Ribbeck (1875: 52), though he left it *ex inc. fab.* in all three of his editions of the fragments.

84 On the line's implications, cf. Wright (2005: 179–180).

aetiology of cult.⁸⁵ Indeed, hero cult was a means, not simply of asserting a connection with the great heroes of myth, but of safely appropriating their greatness, the uncanny numinosity of the powerful dead, in a way which excluded the problematic qualities which such figures would have had when alive, and indeed had as represented on the tragic stage. Oedipus the hero can protect Attica from the grove at Colonus, without importing into the *polis* the irascible, incestuous, parricidal presence of Oedipus the man, and likewise with the inflexible, honour-obsessed Ajax, and even the comprehensively problematic Medea.⁸⁶ Indeed a number of such aetiologies seem to have been polemically invented by tragedians.⁸⁷ The aetiological connection forges a link between past and present, not merely *despite* the distance between them, but *because of* that distance and correspondingly as a means of preserving it.⁸⁸ Without necessarily suggesting that Republican tragedians understood and imitated this dynamic in their Attic predecessors (though there is no good reason categorically to rule that out), simply as a neutral parallel, aetiology—of colonization rather than cult—is a potential connection which Roman tragedy could draw with the Greek heroic past.⁸⁹ Certainly it is possible and attractive to imagine links being drawn with Italian foundations by plays about Diomedes, Philoctetes or Danae, perhaps even by Trojan heroes, though evidence for any of these is, as so often, lacking. However, it is worth drawing the distinction between the cultic aetiologies of Attic tragedy, which maintain the balance between the distance of the problematic hero and his presence as one of the powerful dead, and the civic aetiologies of Republican tragedy, which puts overwhelming emphasis on the distance. Once more, tragedy and tragic myth are distanced and objectified as a Greek artefact which is appropriated rather than assimilated.

To swing the pendulum one final time, I would not by any means reject the relevance of Republican tragedy to contemporary politics. As with Attic tragedy, but with the added licence granted by the large spaces between fragments of evidence, various Republican tragedies have been connected almost

85 On cultic aetiology in Attic tragedy, cf. esp. Seaford (1994: 123–139), Kowalzig (2006), and the play-specific studies in the next note. An extreme example of allegorical interpretation is Vickers (2008); more measured discussion in Bowie (1997).

86 Oedipus: Burian (1974), Kelly (2009: 79–85); Ajax: Burian (1972), Henrichs (1993); Medea: Dunn (1994), Holland (2007–2008).

87 Dunn (2000), Scullion (1999–2000), and note the response by Seaford (2009).

88 Dunn (1996: 52): “the aition draws attention to the gap or divide that it attempts to bridge.”

89 Lefèvre (1990, 2000, 2001 and 2002), and Auhagen (2002). Petaccia (1999) is somewhat different in asserting the aetiological significance of Accius’ *Telephus*, not for Rome or Italy, but for the significant contemporary power of Pergamon.

typologically with various specific historical events: Ennius' *Andromacha* and Flamininus' victory at Cynoscephalae (197 BC), Pacuvius' *Dulorestes* and various slave revolts, Accius' *Atreus* and the Gracchi (133 BC and 123/121 BC).⁹⁰ Such interpretations are impossible to prove or disprove and inevitably depend on a largely subjective feeling of probability. The politics of re-performance in the Late Republic is problematic evidence for that of original performances in the Middle Republic, but all comparative evidence, Greek and later Roman, make it seem unlikely that Republican tragedy was not political, at least in the broad sense that most critics accept that Attic tragedy was political. Whether it served the tendentious ends of specific groups or even of individuals, with Ennius a partisan of M. Fulvius Nobilior or Accius of D. Iunius Brutus Callaecus, is more problematic.⁹¹ Rome, though it has recently been argued it was more democratic than often thought, was certainly not a radical democracy like fifth-century Athens and it is unthinkable that its political tragedies, if such there were, promoted a radical ideology.⁹² However else it Romanized its Greek antecedents, Republican tragedy surely must have adapted its politics to its own society.

5 Conclusion

This chapter has been a necessarily partial look at questions of identity in Republican tragedy and beyond, and in large part a suggestion for avenues to explore as much as a short walk down those avenues. There has not been space to discuss anywhere near every aspect. In particular, the important issue of *fabulae praetextae*, plays apparently in a form resembling tragedy, but with Roman subject-matter which could range from the Regal period to near-contemporary events.⁹³ The existence of these hybrid plays which combined (Greek) tragic form with Roman subject-matter could have various implications for the Romanness of tragedy itself. They could form part of a continuum (perhaps as much tragedies as Aeschylus' *Persians* or Phrynichus' *Sack of Miletus*) showing how the genre as a whole had been appropriated, or conversely they

90 *Andromacha*: Auhagen (2000); *Dulorestes*: Bilinski (1960); *Atreus*: Bilinski (1958).

91 Ennius and Fulvius: Cic. *Arch.* 22, *Brut.* 79, with Goldberg (1989); Accius and Callaecus: Cic. *Arch.* 27, *Brut.* 107, with Bilinski (1958) 45–6, Gabba (1969), Santorelli (1980).

92 Major arguments for the (more) democratic nature of the Roman Republic include Millar (1998), Jakobson (1999), Morstein-Marx (2004), though all focus on the Late Republic and all have their critics.

93 Cf. Flower (1995), Manuwald (2001).

could stand in antithesis to tragedy, a Roman alternative to a genre which retained a stronger sense of its Greekness. As with all of the issues we have looked at, and all the lenses through which we have examined the limited evidence, an often paradoxical contradiction exists: the more Rome Romanized tragedy, the more the genre came to fulfil a parallel to function to that it served in any Greek *polis*, while the more it retained its Greekness, the more Roman the move of appropriating an alien cultural practice remained. The paradox is at the heart of the genre and perhaps of all Roman literature, and it is one which the plays themselves seem to have embraced, in different ways and to different degrees. Perhaps what was most Roman about Republican tragedy was the fact that it existed at all and that it always remained a little bit Greek.⁹⁴

94 This chapter was written as part of my involvement in the University of Sydney Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Collaborative Research Group, *Writing the World: Transnationalism and Translation in Literary Studies*. I am grateful to Peter Morgan and other members of the group for their discussion of some of the ideas contained in it. A version was delivered to the Sydney Latin Summer School 2014, whose audience offered helpful feedback. I am most grateful to the editor George W.M. Harrison for his helpful comments and his patience.

PART 2

Empire



The *editio* of Roman Tragedy

Thomas D. Kohn

It should be self-evident that Senecan tragedy was, in some way, made available to a general public. Someone must have seen, heard or read the *Agamemnon* in order to scrawl a line from it on a wall in Pompeii.¹ In addition, the fact that we have the plays today shows that they were at some point written down and made available for distribution. But it is not the only indication. Quintilian could not have quoted the *Medea apud Senecam* without the play being available to him at the end of the 1st Century.² Nor could the authors of the *Octavia* and the *Hercules Oetaeus* have been able to imitate the style of the authentic plays without the opportunity to study them.³ Thus, we can tell that the tragedies were not hidden away somewhere, nor reserved for a private circle of the playwright's friends.⁴ And while there is much scholarly debate concerning how widespread "literacy" was in Ancient Rome,⁵ and therefore exactly who the potential readers might have been, the evidence strongly suggests that Seneca's plays were somehow available to a reading public.

That is not to say that these tragedies were not meant to be performed.⁶ Indeed, although others disagree, I would maintain that an author in Antiquity would not compose seven complete plays,⁷ containing all of the structural

1 *CIL* 4 *Suppl.* 2, 6698; for further discussion, cf. below 101.

2 Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.9: *quas peti terras iubet?* (*Med.* 453).

3 On the authorship of these two plays, and the influence of the genuine Senecan tragedies on them, cf. Boyle (2006: 221–29).

4 The social status of any such "friends" is hard to know. Quintilian, tutor to Titus, would have moved among the higher classes and the ruling elite; but we have no clue as to the identity, let alone the status, of the pseudo-Senecan poets.

5 Harris (1989) provides some estimates. Johnson in his Introduction to Johnson and Parker (2009: 3) acknowledges Harris' great contribution, even though he "focuses narrowly on the question of what percentage of people in antiquity might have been able to read and write". The essays in Johnson and Parker reflect current thinking that there are different kinds of literacy, as well as different contexts and purposes; cf. also Johnson (2010) and Hedrick (2011: 167–90) on the social functions of literature and literacy.

6 For a recent overview of the performance question, cf. Kohn (2013: 6–13).

7 Cf. below (95–96) on such dilettantes as Pliny the Younger, Augustus and C. Julius Caesar, who each composed at least one play as a youthful exercise. In this context, one could also mention that Sulla is said to have composed "satiric comedies" (Athenaeus 6.261c), which modern scholars believe to have been Atellan farces; cf. Beare (1964: 147, 268) and Beacham (1992: 133).

necessities of tragedy (i.e. a chorus, dialogue, clear indications of stage business, among other things), unless he intended them to be received as plays, that is, performed by actors on a stage.⁸ Roman dramas could be transmitted to an audience as both written texts and as performances. Each medium carries with it certain needs and assumptions, and raises its own questions. This article explores what is known about “publishing” in Rome, of literature in general as well as of tragedy specifically. We will see that by considering the process of making a work public, we may shed new light on such old controversies surrounding Senecan tragedy, such as the performance question, the unfinished nature of the *Phoenissae*,⁹ and the identity of the playwright.¹⁰

Even though the Senecan corpus represents the only complete Roman tragedies to survive to the present day,¹¹ they were not the only dramas to be “published”. When Quintilian makes his recommendations of which Latin tragedies the student orator should read (frequently using a form of the verb *lego* throughout the entire reading list in *Institutio oratoris* 10.1), he names the plays of Accius and Pacuvius, as well as Varius’ *Thyestes* and Ovid’s *Medea*.¹² Evidently, while the *corpora* of the two former playwrights exist today only in fragments and the latter tragedies have not survived at all, at the end of the 1st Century AD they not only were still extant, but, more importantly, at some point and for some reason had been put into circulation as texts. Quintilian goes on to say that Pomponius Secundus was *eorum quos viderim longe princeps* (“most eminent by far of those whom I have seen”, *Institutio oratoris* 10.1.98),¹³ implying that newer tragedies continued to be written and performed during his lifetime. Nevertheless, he lists the benefits of reading privately to oneself (*Institutio oratoris* 10.1.19), indicating that to Quintilian reading a text of a tragedy was just as important and beneficial, if not more so, as seeing it produced in a theatre.

Little is known of how the tragedies of Accius, Pacuvius and others would have been made available to readers in the 2nd Century BC. But comedy provides two interesting case studies. On the one hand, Plautus seems not to have gone to the trouble of preparing authoritative versions of his plays, instead

8 Cf. further Kohn (2013).

9 Cf. Frank (1995: 1–16).

10 Cf. Kohn (2003: 271–80).

11 As opposed to the fragments from earlier tragedians that we still have; cf. Ribbeck (1897/98). For a discussion of the fragments cf. Boyle (2006) and Manuwald in this volume.

12 *Inst.* 10.1.97–98. Note that the works of Seneca *tragicus* are not included, thus reflecting Quintilian’s tacit judgement that the other tragedies were better, or at least more worth reading. The plays of Ovid and Varius are also mentioned in passing at Tac. *Dial.* 12.5.

13 All translations from the Latin are my own.

leaving them to be both revived and revised in performance.¹⁴ As a result, not only did actors' interpolations undoubtedly creep in, but also around 130 plays came to be credited to Plautus.¹⁵ This lack of an authentic text may assist in explaining why they required "editing" by Varro over a century after the playwright's death. Of course, we are left with the questions of how dramatic texts circulated among theatre professionals, as well as how—or whether—this process differed from "publishing" for a non-performing audience. It may, in fact, be an anachronistic dichotomy. Plautus' plays must have been made public, that is, made available to people outside of the playwright's immediate circle, but in a way that allowed for alterations due to performance. On the other hand, Suetonius states that Terence "published" his comedies (*post editas comoedias*, Suetonius *Vita Terentis* 4),¹⁶ presumably making a conscious effort to preserve them in a fixed form. In addition, these plays survived, at least in part, because they were used as school texts.¹⁷ Undoubtedly, this educational usage came about because of Terence's style.¹⁸ But perhaps his comedies also had the advantage of an authoritative text, as opposed to those of Plautus whose authenticity was questioned.¹⁹

The early tragedies of Pliny the Younger, Augustus, and C. Julius Caesar, examples of early dabbling by aristocratic youths, may provide clues concerning the circulation of the *Thyestes* of Varius and the *Medea* of Ovid. Pliny does not relate what happened to the unnamed Greek play he composed when he was fourteen years old, saying only, "it was called a tragedy".²⁰ Suetonius reports that Augustus began an *Ajax*, with which he was dissatisfied (*non succedenti stilo*), and so he destroyed it (*abolevit*), telling his friends that "his Ajax

14 R.J. Tarrant, in Reynolds (1983: 302), posits "after Plautus' death his plays did not circulate immediately in stable published form, but were often performed in theatres instead, undergoing the usual changes introduced by producers and actors". On this process, cf. Marshall (2006) 245–79.

15 Marshall (2006) 257–58.

16 It should be noted that *editio*, besides denoting the publication of a book, can also mean "an exhibition" (Lewis and Short, sv. "editio," 11B), or "the putting on (of a show)" (OLD, sv. "editio," 5), and so also refer to a theatrical production.

17 Cf. Reynolds (1983: 412–20). Grant (1986: ix) suggests that since Horace quotes the plays of Terence frequently, he must have studied them in school. They also appear in Quintilian's list of recommended reading for the aspiring orator (*Inst.* 10.1.99).

18 The comedies of Terence received praise from both Caesar and Cicero; cf. Conte (1994: 101).

19 Reynolds (1983: 302–303).

20 Plin. *Ep.* 7.4.2: *quin etiam quattuordecim natus annos Graecam tragoediam scripsi. 'qualem?' inquis. nescio; tragoedia vocabatur.*

had fallen upon his eraser" (*Aiacem suum in spongiam incubisse*).²¹ These plays by Pliny and Augustus were not meant to be seen or heard by anyone, either as texts or in performance, and so their authors made the manuscripts disappear. Neither author, however, apparently minded if the public knew that the dramas had existed at one time. Suetonius also mentions various works composed by the divine Julius when he was a young man (*a puero et ab adulescentulo quaedam scripta*), including one tragedy, an *Oedipus*. The historian goes on to say that Augustus instructed his librarian, Pompeius Macer (*cui ordinandas bibliothecas delegaverat*), to remove his adopted father's juvenilia from circulation (*omnis libellos vetuit Augustus publicari*).²² *Libelli* is the word generally used by both Pliny and Roman poets to refer to "published" manuscripts.²³ The logical conclusion is that Caesar himself not only failed to destroy his early writings, but in fact distributed them to friends and allowed them to be available to the public (hence, *publicari*).²⁴ It was only through the efforts of Augustus that they "went out of print," i.e., were withdrawn from the public and no longer allowed to be copied. It took either malign neglect or purposeful action on the part of the author, as in the case of Augustus' *Ajax*, or his heirs, as occurred with the *Oedipus* of Caesar, to keep these dramas from circulation or to remove them once they had gotten out. Since the plays of Varius and Ovid were available to Quintilian, we can assume that these poets either wanted their dramas to be accessible to the public, or at the least did not object to their widespread release.²⁵

21 Suet. *Aug.* 85.2. Presumably, this play was composed when the future *princeps* was a young man, and so had not yet been called *Augustus*. But Suetonius is not specific in his chronology.

22 Suet. *Iul.* 56.7.

23 For just a few examples, cf. Catull. 1.1 and 1.8, the introductory epigram to Ov. *Am.*, and Plin. *Ep.* 1.2.6.

24 Tac. *Dial.* 21.6, has the character Marcus Aper note that both G. Julius Caesar and Brutus *fecerunt enim et carmina et in bibliothecas rettulerunt* ("both composed poetry and deposited it in libraries"). Mayer (2001: 158) remarks that "[t]he authors may have hoped thus to preserve, if not exactly publish their poems, since the libraries referred to would have belonged to their friends." As will shortly be seen, however, this comment seems to misunderstand what it meant to "publish".

25 Little is known of Varius' play but Conte (1994: 341) suggests that Ovid may have composed the *Medea* between 12 BC–8 BC. If so, and if it were made public shortly thereafter, then its release, occurring while the poet was still alive, should only have happened with his consent. This could be compared to Vergil's *Aeneid*, which was made accessible against the author's wishes, but only because he was not alive to object.

In any event, “publication” in Ancient Rome was a different concept than what we think of today.²⁶ In a typically tantalizing passage, Pliny says that he had been encouraged to “collect and publish” his letters (*colligerem publicaremque*, *Epistle* 1.1.1). But there were neither academic presses, nor commercial publishers, let alone printing presses. So exactly what does an ancient author mean when he uses the verbs *edere*, *publicare*, *emittere* and the noun *editio*? The letters of Pliny and Cicero contain numerous references,²⁷ but little concrete information about *publicandum* itself; however, they have much to say about the process leading up to it.²⁸ Calling it a “process” may be somewhat misleading, since the “steps” involved could, and did, occur in almost any order. Further, some might even be omitted, while others could be repeated indefinitely. But these seem to be the types of activities that went into preparing a piece for wide-spread release. The author spends some time writing, editing, and revising a particular work.²⁹ He sends it around to various friends whose taste and judgment he trusts, and then revises according to their comments.³⁰ He also might invite a close circle of friends, some of whom perhaps also served as earlier readers, to a *recitatio*,³¹ at which the piece would be read aloud, either by the author himself,³² or by a professional reader.³³ Pliny makes it clear that these affairs should be small, and disdains *recitationes* in front of a large, general audience (*atque haec ita disputo quasi populum in*

26 Starr (1987: 213–23) is the most useful work on the subject of “publication” in Rome, and seminal to the copious discussion subsequent to his article.

27 On the implications of Cicero’s letters and his relationship to Atticus, cf. Philips (1986: 227–37).

28 Cf. Starr (1987: 213–14). The steps described by Cicero and Pliny actually seems surprisingly similar to the current process of preparing a scholarly article for publication, if we consider conferences and colloquia to be the modern equivalent of *recitationes*.

29 There are frequent mentions of the editing process throughout the letters, but Pliny goes into greatest detail at *Ep.* 9.36.2. Cicero also mentions editing and revising, for example at *Att.* 16.3, where he discusses reassigning one of the speeches in the *Acad. Pr.*

30 E.g., *Plin. Ep.* 1.8.3, and *Cic. Att.* 1.13.3.

31 Such private readings are a common subject throughout Pliny’s letters, and Cicero mentions them, e.g., at *Att.* 16.2 and 16.3. Cf. also Funaioli (1920: coll. 435–46), and Winsbury (2009: 95–110). *Plu. Caes.* 2.2, tells the story that Caesar, while being held for ransom by pirates, wrote poems and speeches and used his captors as an audience. Although the story itself may be apocryphal, it is interesting that it includes a detail that sounds suspiciously like a *recitatio*.

32 Pliny mentions reading his own works often, e.g., *Ep.* 3.10.1. He also states that Silius Italicus presented his own poetry at *recitationes* (*Ep.* 3.7.5).

33 At *Ep.* 9.34.1–2 Pliny talks of his inadequacies as a reader, and his intention to let his freedman do it.

auditorium, non in cubiculum amicos advocarim, Pliny *Epistle* 5.3.11),³⁴ at least in part because these readings were a valuable source of feedback. Not only would the listeners make comments, but the author could also receive non-verbal reactions (*multa etiam a multis admonetur* [...] *quid quisque sentiat perspicit ex vultu oculis nutu manu murmure silentio*, Pliny *Epistle* 5.3.9). Notice, however, that reading aloud in front of an audience is an accepted step in the revision process, not only for such a text-based genre as history, but also for the more performance oriented form of oration.³⁵ This cycle of revision and seeking critical comments, to both written and recited texts, can continue, until the author is satisfied with the result. Then and only then is it at last ready to be released to the public. This last point is crucial, as Cicero makes clear in *Epistulae ad Atticum* 3.12 and 3.15, expressing outrage that a certain ill-written speech has gotten into circulation without his consent.³⁶

Publicandum itself can happen in several ways, but Johnson sums it up nicely when he says “‘Publishing’ (*emittere, edere*) was simply the offer to let others copy your literary work without stipulating that they keep it to themselves”.³⁷ The writer himself might present copies to his patron(s) and/or friends;³⁸ an authorized copy could be placed in a central library,³⁹ and/or a copy could be given to a “bookseller”, usually without any financial considerations.⁴⁰ An interested reader outside of the author’s circle would approach whichever depository

34 Also, at Tac. *Dial.*, 10.2, the character Marcus Aper criticizes the *recitatio*, because it does not bring the author widespread fame, reinforcing the idea that such readings were best kept private.

35 *Ep.* 7.17.2–3. Here Pliny also refers to poetry being tried out at the *recitatio*.

36 Cf. also *Att.* 16.2: ‘*de gloria*’ *misi tibi. custodies igitur, ut soles* (“I have sent *de Gloria* to you. Keep it private, as is your custom”), as well as *Att.* 16.3: *eas ego oportet perspiciam, corrigam. tum denique edentur* (“I ought to read and correct these letters. Then, at last, will they be released”).

37 Johnson (2010: 53). Compare Plin. *Ep.* 3.10.4, where the grieving Vestricius Spurinna has promised Pliny that he will keep Pliny’s work concerning the deceased Cottius to himself until Pliny decides it can be circulated.

38 Starr, (1987: 214–15). Tac. *Dial.*, 37.2, refers to these private libraries (*in antiquariorum bibliothecis*).

39 Suetonius must be referring to this when he says that Augustus ordered his librarian to remove Julius Caesar’s juvenilia from circulation (*Iul.* 56.7). On the functioning of libraries in the 2nd Century, as well as bibliography on ancient libraries in general, cf. Houston (2004: 5–13).

40 Pliny talks of wanting to see the books of his friend, Tranquillus, “copied, read and sold” (*describi, legi, venire*, *Ep.* 5.10.3). On the book trade, cf. Starr (1987: 219–23) and Winsbury (2009: 53–75). On the distribution of less current books, cf. Starr (1990: 148–57).

was used, and, at his own expense, have the work copied.⁴¹ It is doubtful that merchants would keep books for sale in stock, instead only arranging to have a copy made of a particular work when it was demanded.⁴²

This leads to one final point of utmost importance: the distribution of a work depends on word of mouth. In the absence of billboards, newspapers and talk shows on radio and television, a potential reader would know about a particular text only if a friend of the author—or someone who attended the *recitatio* at which the piece was read, often the same thing—told another friend, who told yet another friend, and so on. This is surely what Cicero has in mind when asking Atticus to spread word of his book around Greece if he liked it,⁴³ and undoubtedly the intended effect of Quintilian's lengthy list of recommended reading for the budding orator (*Institutio oratoris* 10.1). The author has little control over his work once it is released,⁴⁴ as well as little economic interest in how widespread it becomes;⁴⁵ such information would largely appeal to the author's vanity, not his purse. His only concerns in the process would be to prepare an authoritative text, and then allow it to be released, mostly entrusting the circulation to forces beyond his control.

Turning to plays in general, Pliny lists tragedy, along with history, orations and poetry, among the varieties of genres currently being tried out at *recitationes*.⁴⁶ And although he says it happens, Pliny recognizes that the *recitatio* is not the ideal means of presentation for tragedy, which calls for *non auditorium sed scaenam et actores* ("not an auditorium, but a stage and actors", *Epistle* 7.17.3). We can infer, therefore, that a recital would probably not be the ultimate envisioned venue for a drama.

In this context, the intriguing case of Curiatius Maternus, one of the characters in Tacitus' *Dialogus de oratoribus*, gains crucial importance. The dialogue

41 Starr (1987: 215) refers to Mart. 4.72. The poet refuses a request to supply a free copy of his book, instead insisting that the reader pay for his own. On "professional" vs. "private" copying, cf. Johnson (2004: 157–60).

42 Starr (1987: 220); cf. also Hedrick (2011: 175–85) on the economic distinctions between mass production with a printing press versus copying by hand. For a contrary view, cf. Iddeng (2006: 67).

43 Cic. Att. 2.1: *tu, si tibi placuerit liber, curabis ut et Athenis sit et in ceteris oppidis Graeciae*.

44 On some of the ways that a text could be altered in the process of copying, "correcting," and annotating, cf. McNamee (2010: 20–46).

45 Winsbury (2009: 62) notes that while such authors as Martial and Horace talk about booksellers making a profit, there is no indication that the poets themselves received compensation.

46 Ep. 7.17.3. The practice of reciting tragedy is also discussed by Tacitus throughout the *Dialogus de oratoribus*, but especially 2–3, 11.2.

is represented as a debate concerning the state of oratory between the leading orators of the day, which Tacitus claims to have observed in his youth.⁴⁷ Two of the characters, Marcus Aper and Julius Secundus, pay a visit to their friend, Maternus, who the previous day had given a reading of his *fabula prae-texta*, *Cato* (*nam postero die quam Curiatius Maternus 'Catonem' recitaverat*). The tragedy (*tragoediae*) had caused much offense (*cum offendisse potentium animos diceretur*),⁴⁸ and was being discussed all over the city (*eaque de re per urbem frequens sermo haberetur*, Tacitus, *Dialogus de oratoribus* 2.1). The friends are concerned that this notoriety will prove dangerous for Maternus. They find the playwright consulting “the same book from which he had recited yesterday” (*ipsum quem pridie recitaverat librum*, Tacitus, *Dialogus de oratoribus* 3.1). The use of the word *librum* is interesting here. As mentioned previously, Pliny frequently uses *libellum* to refer to a “published” book. And while he does sometimes use *liber* in the same sense, for example in *Epistles* 1.20.4, 6.16.3 and 6.20.5—all letters written to Tacitus—the word also seems to refer to a work in progress in two other letters to Tacitus: *Epistles* 7.20.1 and 8.7.1–2. Here, it must mean the not quite finished script of the play. Secundus then asks Maternus if he intends to edit the play carefully (*an ideo librum istum adprehendisti ut diligentius retractares*) before sending it out into the world (*emitteres 'Catonem'*, Tacitus *Dialogus de oratoribus* 3.2). Maternus replies that he will change little for subsequent readings; indeed, Secundus will recognize what he already heard (*agnosces quae audisti*, Tacitus *Dialogus de oratoribus* 3.3). The implication is clear: Secundus, being a friend and trusted critic, was at the previous *recitatio* and gave his opinion of the work. Nevertheless, the playwright has chosen to ignore his friend’s advice, likely hoping that the wide-spread rumors will create a buzz and increase demand for the play, in whatever form he has in mind. Maternus goes on to say that he plans to present an equally offensive *Thyestes* at a subsequent *recitatio* (*quod si qua omisit 'Cato', sequenti recitatione 'Thyestes' dicet*), and that he is hastening to make the *Cato* ready for public display (*maturare libri huius editionem festino*, Tacitus *Dialogus de oratoribus* 3.3). This may mean that Maternus intends to release his *Cato* as a book; however, following the previous usage of *liber*, here the word may instead refer to the script of the play, and so indicate plans for a more traditional, theatrical performance. The only certitudes are that the *recitatio* was not ultimate delivery

47 Scholars generally agree that the dramatic date of the piece is 75 AD, as Mayer (2001: 16) and Syme (1958: 104), although the date of composition is still under debate, so Mayer (2001: 22–27).

48 On the very real danger that tragedy could cause offence and incur punishment, cf. Mayer (2001: 92–93).

mode for the *Cato*, and that the word of mouth generated by the reading will almost guarantee widespread reception.

At last, what light does this discussion of *editio* shine upon the Senecan tragedies? First, since references to the plays are found in the writings of Quintilian (*Institutio oratoris* 9.2.9) and Sidonius (*Carmen* 9.232–238), and since they influenced the composers of the *Octavia* and the *Hercules Oetaeus*, we can assume that they were indeed “published”. This would suggest that they went through a process of revision and editing, such as that described by Cicero and Pliny. If so, the playwright would have sent the unfinished manuscript to friends for comment; all or sections of the dramas would have been presented at *recitationes*, but only as another method of eliciting critical feedback.⁴⁹ They still may or may not have been performed on the stage, although this certainly would have served as an effective way of gaining public attention and creating demand, and thus could be an argument in favor of production even if “publication” was the playwright’s final ambition for the dramas.⁵⁰ Ultimately, their author would have placed them in a library, public or private, or given them to a bookseller, with permission for them to be copied. Finally, Seneca *tragicus* would have encouraged—or at least allowed—his friends to tell others about the tragedies.

Nevertheless, there is some indication that *editio* was not the only way the plays were presented to the public. A line from the *Agamemnon* (*Idaea cerno nemora*, *Agamemnon* 730) is preserved as graffito found in the ruins of Pompeii.⁵¹ The *CIL* prints it as *idai cernu nemura*.⁵² The graffito, underneath what appears to be a rough drawing of mountains and what could be another quote from the *Agamemnon*,⁵³ was discovered on the wall of a house “near to the ground”.⁵⁴ This piece of evidence could indicate several things. First, the

49 Conversely, Fantham (1982: 46–49) sees the *recitatio* simply as a performance option, one of several alternatives to full-scale theatrical production. Of course, a *recitatio* could also occur after a full-scale production. If organized by the playwright, it could provide one more opportunity for feedback before producing an authoritative edition. Or else the play could be recited by some other party entirely, perhaps someone who simply enjoyed it the first time and wanted to hear it again.

50 Performance on stage could also be a source of critical feedback in multiple ways. The playwright could make changes to a text based on comments by the actors during rehearsals. Or he could base alterations on audience responses.

51 *CIL* 4 Suppl. 2, 6698.

52 Lebek (1985: 2). In fact the orthography reads IDAI CIIRNU NIIMURA.

53 Lebek (1985: 1–6).

54 *in cellae quae horto a.d. adiacet pariete dextro, prope terram*. A. Mau in the *CIL*, as quoted by Lebek (1985: 2).

misspellings suggest that the line was heard and not read. In addition, it is hard to imagine that a member of Seneca's circle, who would have been invited to a *recitatio*, would inscribe the line on a wall at all,⁵⁵ let alone place it so low. Thus, it seems that the line, and presumably the entire play—especially likely if the graffito above it is also from the *Agamemnon*—was heard by an audience beyond the playwright's friends and social class, and so not at a *recitatio*, but probably a more traditional performance. Perhaps, either the "published" manuscript was intended to allow others to stage the plays, or else the staging was meant to provide publicity and demand for the text.

Next, the process of "publication" may provide an explanation for the present unfinished condition of the *Phoenissae*. This play, probably one of the last Seneca composed,⁵⁶ exists as sections of three or maybe four episodes, with no choral songs, prologue or conclusion.⁵⁷ There would seem to be two possibilities: first, it was left unfinished by the author, either abandoned intentionally or interrupted by other activities or even death. Second, only portions of it were copied. If the former is true, why would the playwright allow the play to be released in this form? Could it be an indication that Seneca died before the *Phoenissae* was completed, and the play was released posthumously by his friends or relatives? If the latter is the case, again, why would only certain passages, none of which contain choral songs, be copied?⁵⁸ Could it have come from a prompt-script used by an actor, containing only his lines and cues, and thus suggesting theatrical performance?⁵⁹ To further complicate the matter,

55 Franklin (1991: 80), notes that "[g]raffiti . . . appear to have been written mostly by members of the lower classes." Thus, the presence of the line from the *Agamemnon* suggests the text was available to an audience beyond the Roman elite.

56 Fitch (1981: 289–307).

57 Frank (1994: 1–2). Regardless of its fragmentary nature, Kohn (2013: 133–39) shows that the playwright still paid attention to dramaturgical concerns.

58 As a point of comparison, consider the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel, a Hellenistic tragedy in Greek, telling the story of the exodus of the Hebrews from Egypt. This also exists only in fragments, lacking choral passages, and preserved by Eusebius (*PE* 9.28–29) and Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* 1.23.155–156). These two authors, however, used quotes and excerpts to make a larger point, and so it should be no surprise that they included only select passages. On the other hand, the *Phoenissae* is preserved for us in the manuscripts with the other plays. If its preservation followed the model of Ezekiel's play, it would have to have been excerpted, circulated within another work, and then reassembled at a fairly early date. A much more reasonable supposition is that Seneca's play was copied in the form in which we have it from the very start. On Ezekiel, cf. Holladay (1989) and Jacobson (1983).

59 On the idea of 'parts' in connection with Greek tragedy, cf. Marshall (2004: 27–45).

Fitch argues that certain scenes from the complete Senecan tragedies were meant for performance, while others were intended for recitation.⁶⁰ According to this model, only the performable sections of the *Phoenissae* would have been copied, while the others were not.

Additionally, the concept of *publicandum* raises even more questions about the lack of mention of the plays by Seneca *philosophus* and the historians who wrote about him. If the philosopher willingly allowed his tragedies to be copied and dispersed (as seems clear), we should expect some mention of it, from him, or from Tacitus, Dio Cassius, and/or Suetonius. In contrast, Augustus (above 95–96) suppressed his own early attempt at composing drama, along with that of his adopted father, yet Suetonius recorded their existence for posterity. Granted, the mere absence of mention is not by itself proof of anything. But, there are ample opportunities for the historians and Lucius Annaeus Seneca *himself* to bring up his own dramas, with no more contrivance than Suetonius used to discuss the plays of Julius and Augustus. Moreover, the author's circulation of his work among his friends was a commonly used step in the process of *editio*, followed by the allowance, at least tacitly, for the wider release and word of mouth. The complete silence concerning plays that must have been “published” is peculiar and can be seen to provide further evidence against the common ascription of these plays to Nero's tutor and advisor.⁶¹

Finally, it becomes clear that Roman tragedy would have had at least two different potential modes of transmission: as a written text and as a performance.⁶² Thus, the questions of whether the plays of Seneca were meant to be performed or meant to be read should both be answered, ‘yes’. Both methods of delivery may have been utilized, much as they were for the other examples of ancient tragedy that survived beyond the deaths of their composers. Further, the question of whether the plays were delivered at a *recitatio* becomes more complicated. They probably were. But recitation could be a step in the process of *editio*, the final method of performance, or in fact both. Much in the same way light shows characteristics of both a wave and a particle, tragedy is a complex phenomenon, which can be presented and transmitted in both textual and performance contexts.

In the end, we may have raised more questions about the plays of Seneca than we have answered. But this discussion has shown the importance for

60 Fitch (2000: 1–12).

61 For other arguments, cf. Kohn (2003: 271–80).

62 This would also imply two different audiences: the more literary crowd, possibly aristocratic, and a mixture of social registers.

modern readers of Roman tragedy, and indeed of all ancient literature, both Greek and Roman, to keep in mind that “publication” meant something different in antiquity than it does today, and that the efforts an author would have taken in making his work accessible to the public needs to be considered no less than any other philological concern.⁶³

63 Just like Pliny and Cicero, I am indebted to friends and colleagues who have read and commented on earlier drafts of this paper: George M.W. Harrison, C.W. Marshall, Kathleen McNamee, R. Scott Smith and Dana Sutton.

Rhetorical Tragedy: The Logic of Declamation

David Konstan

In a recent dissertation that takes the form of a commentary on the first 705 verses of the *Hercules Oetaeus* “attributed to Seneca,” Lucia Degiovanni remarks of the prologue recited by Hercules (more precisely, of the “monologic section,” that is, verses 1–98 addressed to Jupiter or to the cosmos in general): “it has been considered, by those who maintain that the work is not authentic, to be a cento of passages from Seneca’s tragedies (in particular, of the *Hercules Furens*), bloated and needlessly repetitive,” and she adds: “in fact a certain redundancy is undeniable in Hercules’ boasting about his own labors,” and she notes that he mentions his descent to Hades and the abduction of the dog Cerberus no fewer than four times (13–14, 23–24, 46–48, 79). Nevertheless, Degiovanni argues, “it is possible to identify a coherent rhetorical pattern in Hercules’ speech.” She divides it into four sections, each of which has two parts: first, a recollection of his labors, and second, a demand for his divinization. What is more, the four segments exhibit a progression, according to which the first part, on his merits, expands and becomes more extravagant as his attitude increasingly bears the stamp of *hybris*.¹ This movement is not without a larger purpose, according to Degiovanni. For if Hercules emerges clearly as a benefactor of humanity, his oration nevertheless reveals his arrogance, which is precisely the reason why he cannot yet gain admission to heaven: “Only when, through his struggle with physical pain, he succeeds in acquiring the greatness

1 Degiovanni (2010): “La sezione monologica (1–98) è stata considerata, da quanti sostengono la non autenticità dell’opera, come un centone di passi di tragedie senecane (in particolare dell’*Hercules Furens*), ampolloso e inutilmente ripetitivo (cfr. da ultimo ZWIERLEIN 1986, pp. 314–318). In effetti è innegabile una certa ridondanza nel vanto delle proprie imprese, da parte di Ercole: alla sola discesa nell’Ade e al rapimento del cane Cerbero si fa riferimento ben quattro volte (13–14, 23–24, 46–48, 79). È possibile tuttavia individuare uno schema retorico coerente nel discorso di Ercole. La perorazione della sua causa può essere suddivisa in quattro sezioni, ciascuna delle quali s’articola in due momenti consecutivi: (a) rievocazione delle imprese compiute; (b) richiesta di divinizzazione. Queste quattro sequenze sono a loro volta disposte secondo una *climax*, che procede verso una sempre maggiore espansione della parte dedicata alla rivendicazione dei propri meriti, con un atteggiamento sempre più improntato all’*hybris* da parte dell’eroe” (129–30). Degiovanni indicates the four sections and their subdivisions as follows: I (a) 1–7^a; (b) 7^b–13^a; II (a) 13^b–30^a; (b) 30^b–33; III (a) 34–64^a; (b) 64^b–78; IV (a) 79–91; (b) 92–99.

and imperturbability of the Stoic sapiens will he be ready for apotheosis," as happens in the finale of the play.²

Degiovanni's analysis is ingenious and plausible, and makes good sense of the theme of the play; it exhibits the sophisticated construction of the speech, without regard to whether the tragedy is in fact by Seneca or an imitator (as Degiovanni herself is inclined to believe). I wish here to attend, however, to what we may call the micro-structure of the rhetoric, the small moves and transitions that give the style its coruscating quality. Seneca, as I will call the author (understand "pseudo-Seneca" if you prefer), makes heavy demands on the spectators or readers, who are required to fill in information and make connections on their own. This is in line with the expectations of active reading that was characteristic of classical literature generally, but Seneca is particularly adept at exploiting the technique.³ In what follows, I will take a jeweler's loupe to the prologue of the play, which runs for some 103 verses.

We may begin by examining the opening verses of the prologue (1–17):⁴

{Herc.} *Sator deorum, cuius excussum manu
utraeque Phoebi sentiunt fulmen domus,
secure regna: protuli pacem tibi,
quacumque Nereus porrigi terras vetat.
non est tonandum; perfidi reges iacent,* 5
*saevi tyranni. fregimus quidquid fuit
tibi fulminandum. sed mihi caelum, parens,
adhuc negatur. parui certe Ioue
ubique dignus teque testata est meum
patrem noverca. quid tamen nectis moras?* 10
*numquid timemur? numquid impositum sibi
non poterit Atlas ferre cum caelo Herculem?
quid astra, genitor, quid negas? mors me tibi
certe remisit, omne concessit malum*

2 "Ercole è sì il benefattore dell'umanità, ma la perorazione stessa che egli pronuncia per ottenere la divinizzazione mette a nudo la sua arroganza e rivela allo spettatore il motivo per cui egli non può, al momento attuale, essere ammesso in cielo. Solo quando, attraverso la lotta con il dolore fisico, riuscirà ad assumere la grandezza e l'imperturbabilità del *sapiens* stoico, sarà pronto per l'apoteosi" (130).

3 On the active role of readers in classical antiquity, cf. Konstan (2006), (2009), (2010) and Johnson (2010).

4 All translations of Seneca are my own, and taken from my forthcoming versions of the two Hercules plays in the Chicago edition of the complete works of Seneca in translation.

quod terra genuit, pontus aer inferi: 15
nullus per urbes errat Arcadias leo,
Stymphalis icta est, Maenali nulla est fera. . . .

{Herc.} You who sowed the gods, whose lightning, launched
 from your hand, both houses of the Sun perceive,
 you may rule safely now: I've pushed peace forward for you
 to wheresoever the Sea prevents the land's extending.
 No need to thunder: treacherous kings, cruel tyrants, 5
 are laid low. I have smashed whatever deserved to be
 blasted with lightening. But heaven, Father,
 is still denied me. Surely I have shown myself worthy
 of Jupiter everywhere, and that you are my father
 she—my stepmother—testifies. Why do you weave delays? 10
 Am I feared? Will Atlas be unable to uphold heaven
 if Hercules as well is loaded on him?
 Why, father, why deny me still the stars? Surely death⁵ has
 released me to you: every evil has surrendered
 that earth or sea or hell has sired. 15
 No Arcadian lion prowls through cities,
 the Stymphalian bird's been shot, there's no Maenalian beast. . . .

The invocation to Jupiter opens with the formula, *Sator deorum* or “father of the gods” (or “of gods”). The expression is less common than “father of gods and men”,⁶ but the abbreviated form is not without purpose: if Jupiter is father of gods, and is the father as well of Hercules, it follows that Hercules ought to be a god (so Degiovanni *ad* 1), which is just the status that he is about to claim. Jupiter is then presented in his capacity as master of lightning, his principal attribute: it is perceived where Phoebus, that is, the sun, rises and where he ends his daily journey. The metonymy of Phoebus as the sun keeps the focus on the gods and their place in the heavens, as opposed to the earth, whence Hercules speaks; but it is worth noting that Apollo, too, is a son of Jupiter, and he is in the sky, whether we identify Apollo with the sun or think of him in his usual character as the bow-bearing, lyre-playing young deity. If this offspring of Jupiter has his domain among the stars, why not Hercules?

5 Perhaps a reference to the underworld, which Hercules visited and survived, but looking forward to his own death as well.

6 Cf. Virgil *Aeneid* 1.254 = 11.725 *hominum sator atque deorum*; Phaedrus *Fables* 3.17.10 *deorum genitor atque hominum sator*.

This much is familiar, but the next verse introduces a surprise: *secure regna*, “reign secure” (*secure* is vocative). Although Jupiter’s thunderbolts are a sign of his power, suddenly they seem to have defensive function, as though what happens on earth could threaten his rule. It turns out that Hercules’ activities in this world have in fact served to protect his father, inasmuch as he has provided peace for Jupiter the world over, or, as Seneca phrases it, wherever Nereus sets a limit to land. Once again, as with Phoebus, there is metonymy, this time with Nereus standing for the sea or perhaps for the river Ocean, which embraces the world; and once again, it is not without significance. The eleventh chore that the tyrant Eurystheus assigned to Hercules, in addition to the original ten (because he had assistance in the execution of two of them: cf. Apollodorus *Library* 2.5.2, 2.5.5, 2.5.11), was to fetch the golden apples of the Hesperides, a task that Hercules himself soon mentions in his catalogue of his labors (alluded to rather cryptically in 18: *sparsit peremptus aureum serpens nemus*, The dragon’s killed, spattering his golden grove). As he marched to fulfill the order, he encountered Nereus, of whom he inquired about the location of the Hesperides. When Nereus refused to instruct him, Hercules held him fast, despite his shape-shifting, until he finally released the information.⁷ Nereus, the ancestor of the sea nymphs or Nereids, is one of the lesser nature deities who do not have their dwelling on Olympus; that Hercules defeated him in the course of one of his labors is again a sign of his right to claim a place among the stars.

Hercules, then, has conquered lands up to where Nereus blocks their extension, and he has overcome Nereus or the sea as well. Having mastered the two sublunary elements, earth and water, he is ready now to enter the fiery realm of sun and lightning, that is, the heaven that is still denied him (*caelum/adhuc negatur*, 7–8). He is the more prepared in that Jupiter’s weapons, which are intended to punish oppressors in this world, are no longer needed, since Hercules has broken their power, thereby not only displacing Jupiter as dispenser of justice but also beating down any potential challenge to his father’s authority. Now that there is no need for Hercules himself on earth, the way is clear for him to ascend to heaven and, at the same time, Jupiter can cease to fulminate.

But if Hercules has made Jupiter’s thunderbolts otiose, and in fact helped to secure his reign, he may well seem to be not just a bulwark for his father but a potential competitor. This possibility is, I think, momentarily inti-

7 The story goes back at least to Pherecydes (6th c. BC), according to the scholia on Apollonius of Rhodes’, *Argonautica*, 4.1396–1399^b, p. 315.18–24 Wendel; for early visual representations, cf. Ruth Glynn (1981: 121–22).

mated when Hercules asks why his father is causing delays (*quid tamen nectis moras?*, 10)—note that he ascribes the responsibility for procrastinating to Jupiter himself—and then, by way of a hypothetical explanation, suggests that perhaps he inspires fear (*numquid timemur?*, 11). The danger that a son might displace the ruler of the gods was by no means negligible (as Juno herself observes in *Hercules Furens* 64–68): it is how Jupiter himself came to power, and in some mythological traditions, loosely associated with Orphism, it was anticipated that Jupiter would yield the throne in turn, whether to Dionysus or some other figure. Thus, the stability of the Olympian regime was not to be taken for granted, and Jupiter's sons in particular had to make it clear that they served their father and posed no threat to his authority. Apollo himself is an example of such a good son. According to the narrative recounted in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (300–362), when Juno, in a rage because Jupiter had given birth to Athena on his own, caused the earth to give birth to a monster that would be as much superior to Jupiter as he was to his own father (339), Apollo slew the monster, thereby securing his father's dominion. In like spirit, Hercules emphasizes that his actions have not been rebellious but rather generous in character; as he puts it, he has proved himself universally worthy of Jupiter and indeed even Juno, his stepmother, bears witness to the fact that he is Jupiter's son (*parui certe Ioue / ubique dignus teque testata est meum / patrem noverca*, 8–10). This latter observation is usually explained as an elliptical argument: Juno demonstrates that she is Hercules' stepmother by her abiding hatred of her stepson (such hostility was proverbial on the part of stepmothers), and if she is indeed his stepmother, then she must be married to his father; hence, Jupiter is Hercules' father. Taken this way, *noverca* is not simply descriptive, but follows from her antagonism to Hercules (cf. Degiovanni *ad* 9–10, pp. 135–36). But the verse may also be understood as affirming Juno's willing recognition, however belated, of Hercules' paternity, now that he has accomplished all his assignments on earth. If even she is on his side, what reason is there for further procrastination? Like Apollo, who killed the monster sent by Juno, Hercules deserves to be made welcome in heaven. He has no designs on his father's throne.

If Seneca has planted the hint of a potential rivalry between Hercules and his father, Hercules at once deflects it by suggesting ironically a different reason for Jupiter's anxiety: he may be worried that if Hercules enters heaven then, because of the additional weight, it might prove too heavy a burden for Atlas to sustain (11–12). Hercules' bulk is a traditional theme: he weighs down the Argo in Apollonius' epic, and he is said elsewhere to have been in danger of sinking the ship if he had joined the expedition (Scholia to Apollonius of Rhodes, *Argonautica* 1.1290). Hercules' question is apparently rhetorical, since

he does not provide an answer to it, but goes on to ask: "Why, father, why deny me still the stars?" (3). Still, there remains the hint of arrogance in the suggestion, however ironic, that Hercules might outweigh all the other gods together. There is an abiding tension in Hercules' demand for divinization between humility and conceit.

Hercules now adds the further argument that death has sent him back, or has released him (*mors me tibi / certe remisit*, 13–14): the language is ambiguous, since *remittere* can mean both things. The explanation given by the commentators is that Hercules is referring to his visit to the underworld, whence, as one of his labors, he dragged the dog Cerberus to the light of day; *mors* or "death," then, is a metonymy for Hades, which has returned him to the upper world (cf. Degiovanni *ad* 13–14, p. 138). Yet Hercules will shortly include the fetching of Cerberus in the inventory of his labors (23–24), so the statement here would seem to have a larger purpose: proleptically, his own death has released him to Jupiter, the death that he expects and desires now that his labors are accomplished. His death is, of course, the condition for his joining the gods, and it is as though he regards himself as already dead even as he makes his plea. As he says, every evil has now surrendered—all that land, sea, air, or the underworld has produced—he implies the three lower elements of earth, water, and air—and even the nether world has yielded; his mission is done, and there is no reason for him to go on living as a mortal. But the mention of the denizens of Hades (*infern*, 15) activates the suggestion that he has survived Death itself, and so is prepared to ascend to the upper sky as a god.

With this, Hercules rounds off the petition to his father (*negas* in 19 answers to *negatur* in 8), and he now embarks on the catalogue of his achievements, beginning with the Nemean lion, the birds that plagued the region around Stymphalus, and the boar that haunted Mount Maenalus in Arcadia, and continuing with the full list of his other nine labors (16–27). The catalogue in turn is framed by verses of one and a half lines that clearly echo each other:

*omne concessit malum
quod terra genuit, pontus aer inferi* (14–15)

every evil has surrendered
that earth or sea or hell has sired.

*quodcumque tellus genuit infesta occidit
meaque fusum est dextera* (28–29).

Whatever the hostile earth has borne has fallen,
laid low by my right hand.

The phrase *tellus genuit* in the second passage echoes *terra genuit* in the first, just as *infesta* corresponds to *malum*. Hercules goes on to affirm:

iratis deis
non licuit esse. si negat mundus feras,
animum noverca, redde nunc nato patrem
uel astra forti (29–32).

I have not let
 the gods be angry. If the world denies me beasts,
 my stepmother her loathing—then give the father back,
 the very stars, to the brave son.

Why are the gods no longer permitted to be angry? Degiovanni (*ad* 30–31, pp. 145–146) cites two explanations: first, that the gods can no longer be enraged at the monsters that roamed the earth, since Hercules has slain them all; and second, that the monsters are the instruments by which the gods manifest their anger against human beings, and since they are gone, the gods can no longer rage as they had done. But surely, in ridding the world of monsters, Hercules eliminated the evils that had caused Jupiter to hurl his lightning bolts; these verses thus answer to Hercules' earlier claim to have removed any need for his father's lightning and thunder, since he has brought down the cruel kings and tyrants. There is thus no reason for the gods' ire. The word *licuit*, "let" or "allowed," seems supercilious, but Hercules' braggadocio goes hand in hand with his claims to have done the gods a favor.

In the phrase, *redde nunc nato patrem / uel astra forti* (give the father back, the very stars, to the brave son), Hercules juxtaposes his father with the supra-mundane world, practically asserting their equivalence. There is nothing exceptional in this: Jupiter is the sky god, and his identification with the *pneuma* or "spirit" that permeates the universe was good Stoic doctrine. The expression recalls, in turn, the earlier apposition of sky and Jupiter in the lines: *sed mihi caelum, parens, / adhuc negatur* (But heaven, Father, / is still denied me, 7–8; *parens* is of course vocative, but it resonates with *caelum* by position all the same). This explains why Hercules asks for the father to be restored to the son rather than the other way around, which might seem the natural way of putting it; as Degiovanni notes, "the expression is in enallage [i.e., grammatical inversion or substitution]: it would be more appropriate to say 'restore the son to the father and the hero to the stars.'"⁸ Hercules means that heaven

8 "La formulazione è in enallage; sarebbe stato più proprio dire 'restituisci il figlio al padre e l'eroe alle stelle,'" *ad* 31–32, p. 147.

should now be his. What is more, the word *astra* or ‘stars’ occurs in the same place in the line in both passages (*uel astra forti*, 32 answers to *quid astra, genitor*, 13), and *negat* in 30 recalls *negas* in 13 (and cf. *negatur*, 8). Finally, Juno as stepmother figures in both passages, and in both in a complex way. We have already noted how Juno’s bearing witness to Jupiter as the father of Hercules (*teque testata est meum / patrem noverca*, 9–10) can be read either as a reference to her hatred of her stepson or to her acknowledgement of his right to ascend to heaven as a son of the father of gods. The second reference to Juno as stepmother is equally subtle. On the one hand, now that the world has ceased to produce wild beasts, there is no opportunity for Juno to manifest her hatred toward her stepson; thus, Degiovanni writes:

The overall meaning of the passage is as follows: since it is not possible for the gods to be angry, insofar as they are lacking the instruments (that is, the monsters) with which to act it out, so too Juno, because *negat mundus feras*, cannot manifest her own wrath.⁹

This interpretation supposes that Juno remains hostile to her stepson but no longer has any means of opposing him. But we can also understand the lines to mean that in Hercules’ momentary fantasy of having removed all evils and causes for divine anger, even Juno has abandoned her animus against him, and so the way should be open to his father’s realm, that is, the stars. There is the suggestion, then, that Juno herself may be on Hercules’ side, and if he has her favor then he ought to have his father back as well.

With this, Hercules changes tack and seems concerned to make his father’s task easier in elevating his son to the stars: “I do not ask that you show me the way,” he states (*nec peto ut monstres iter*, 32); he needs only Jupiter’s permission, and he will find the path. But while this seems to be a considerate way of relieving Jupiter of a preoccupation, it also indicates Hercules’ confidence that he can forge the way to heaven on his own, and plants the idea, however subtly, that he could make the attempt even without his father’s consent (a threat that in his madness he makes openly in *Hercules Furens*, 955–73). Thus, when he utters his next words, “Or if you fear . . .” (*vel si times*, 32), one almost expects that he will withdraw the claim and ask for Jupiter’s guidance. There is an echo here of the earlier passage in which it seemed that the reason for Hercules’ exclusion from heaven was that he was feared (*timemur*, 11). Just as the hint of

9 “Il significato complessivo del passo è il seguente: come agli dei non è stato possibile essere in collera, in quanto venivano a mancare loro gli strumenti per esplicitarla (cioè i mostri), così anche Giunone, poiché *negat mundus feras*, non può manifestare la propria ira” (*ad* 30–31, p. 147).

a threat then was dissipated by the suggestion that his huge weight might be a problem for Atlas (though this thought itself bore a note of *hybris*), so too, here the cause of Jupiter's fear is immediately spelled out as the possibility that the earth might bear new monsters; if this is so, then there may still be need of Hercules below. His response, while he is still alive, to this prospect is: "Bring them on, and quickly (*properet malum quodcumque*)!" Hercules' point is that he is prepared to dispatch the new creatures and, after a brief delay, proceed to heaven. To show that he and he alone is equal to the challenge, he reminds his father that his deeds have won him fame everywhere: *nulla me tellus silet* (no land is silent about me, 39). And he boasts (40–45):

*me sensit ursae frigidum Scythicae genus
Indusque Phoebo subditus, cancro Libys;
te, clare Titan, testor: occurri tibi
quacumque fulges, nec meos lux prosequi
potuit triumphos, solis excessi vices
intraque nostras substitit metas dies.*

The freezing race of the Scythian bear¹⁰ has seen me,
the Indus beneath the Sun, Libya beneath the Crab.
I call you, bright Titan, in witness: I have met up with you
wherever you shine, but your light has not be able
to follow my triumphs. I have exceeded your cycles
and the day has halted short of my turning posts.

Within the space of two verses, Hercules refers to the sun as Phoebus, that is, Apollo, and as the Titan Helios, who was traditionally identified with the sun. The conflation is not remarkable, since both gods had long been used metaphorically in this way. We may, however, see here another, more explicit sign of Hercules' rivalry with Apollo, which was adumbrated in the second verse of the prologue. Because he has outdone the sun's own orbit, Hercules is even more worthy of being a god than Apollo, that other son of Jupiter. The passage nicely illustrates Seneca's compositional density: Hercules simultaneously stakes a claim to divinity on the basis of his many adventures, as he did earlier in the review of his labors; shows that he can dispatch any new challenges that the earth may engender, and so may depart from it and join the gods; and

10 The reference is to the northern constellation of Ursa Major; the Indus River is to the east, near the Sun's rising; the sun enters the constellation of the Crab in summer, hence the association with heat and (here) with Libya.

demonstrates that he is superior to Apollo, who occupies a place of privilege in the heavens, and hence is the more worthy of apotheosis.

Having challenged Apollo as the sun, Hercules now insists that he overcame night as well, since he descended to Hades, another triumph over the sun, which cannot reach the underworld. This leads him to think of the farthest Ocean—Hercules is evidently on a roll, and pulling out all the stops—which he navigated safely despite storms, likely a reference to the task of obtaining the cattle of Geryon, who was imagined as residing on the island of Erythea, located in the western Ocean (Apollodorus *Bibliotheca* 2.106). Ever competitive, he declares that Perseus, who had traveled to the river Ocean in order to fetch the Gorgon's head, isn't a patch on him (*pars quota est Perseus mei?*, 51); the implicit complaint is that Perseus was transformed into a constellation, and so he now resides in the heavens, from which Hercules, who has done as much and more, is still excluded. Nor ought one to overlook the detail that Perseus too was a son of Jupiter. The parallel with Apollo is clear.

The implied catasterism of Perseus prepares the scene for Hercules' next array of monsters to fight, which are those that have been translated into the heavens by Juno. But first, Hercules explains that, in fact, and despite his earlier suggestion that the earth might generate new prodigies, the earth is now afraid (*timet*, 54) to conceive beasts for him to conquer, nor can it discover any. Whereas before he lamented that heaven was denied him (*caelum adhuc negatur*, 7–8), now it is beasts that are denied (*ferae negantur*, 55). Indeed, he had affirmed this earlier (*si negat mundus feras*, 30), but then it was in the hope that Juno had laid down her anger, whereas this time Hercules claims rather to have vanquished them all—and yet to no avail. Hercules waxes proud of his achievements, going so far as to assert that he is the prodigy now rather than the monsters he defeated (*Hercules monstri loco / iam coepit esse*, 55–56), a claim that resonates ambiguously: has he become the new menace on the earth? Nor did he perform his feats at the orders of Eurystheus: his own courage (*virtus*, 62) drove him, a harsher mistress than Juno. The peace he said he had brought to his father (*protuli pacem tibi*, 3) now indeed reigns on earth, but the conflict continues in the sky: *non habent pacem dei* (The gods have no peace, 64).

The shift from earth to sky serves several rhetorical purposes. Hercules is all the more indignant that not just other sons of Jupiter occupy the heavens but even the very beasts he had slain, including the Crab (sent by Juno to distract Hercules while he was battling the Hydra) and the Lion, got there before him (72–73). Again, Hercules had boasted that he would find his own way to the firmament, and the presence of monsters there makes that all the more

challenging: far from being afraid, he declares that he will have his place there even if Juno renders it worse than earth and hell. Finally, the thought that he may be blocked from heaven drives Hercules to still greater flights of fury, as he threatens to join Sicily's Mount Pelorus to Italy, driving out the waters that separate them (that is, the Straits of Messina). The purpose of this exercise is at first unclear, but it suggests the attempt that the Giants made on Olympus by piling Mount Pelion on Mount Ossa: Hercules seems bent on forging his way to heaven, willy-nilly. It is only afterwards that he qualifies the implied menace with the words, addressed to Jupiter, "If you decree it joined" (*si iungi iubes*, 82), and goes on to propose eliminating the Isthmus of Corinth and transforming the world by altering the course of its great rivers. What looked to be the height of arrogance is mutated into additional forms of service at Jupiter's behest (as opposed to Juno's), but though Hercules had in fact, during his lifetime, performed similar kinds of feats, such as opening the Straits of Gibraltar and creating a path for the river Peneus, his intention to "subvert the laws of nature and gratuitously disturb the earth's appearance with the sole purpose of showing off his own strength gives a stamp of mounting *hybris* to Hercules' speech."¹¹

The tension between deference to his father and consciousness of his own worth pervades Hercules' discourse, putting his credentials as a Stoic hero to the test: on the one hand, he is the model of disciplined service to Jupiter, who was identified in Stoic theory with the rational intelligence that informs the universe; on the other hand, his confidence in his own courage—the word is *virtus*, which may equally signify moral virtue—manifests itself as a sublime egotism that challenges the world order and aligns him with such dangerously proud protagonists of Senecan tragedy as Atreus and Medea. The genius of Hercules' speech here is the way it oscillates between the two perspectives within a single line or phrase.

Hercules concludes his address to Jupiter with the following verses (87–98):

*Da, da tuendos, Iuppiter, saltem deos:
illa licebit fulmen a parte auferas,
ego quam tuebor. sive glaciale polum,
seu me tueri feruidam partem iubes,* 90
*hac esse superos parte securos puta.
Cirrhaea Paeon templa et aetheriam domum*

11 Degiovanni *ad* 99–103, pp. 160–161: "l'intento programmatico di sovvertire le leggi della natura e di sconvolgere l'aspetto della terra in modo gratuito, volto unicamente all'ostentazione della propria forza, conferisce un'impronta di crescente *hybris* al discorso di Ercole."

*serpente caeso meruit—o quotiens iacet
 Python in hydra! Bacchus et Perseus deis
 iam se intulere—sed quota est mundi plaga
 oriens subactus aut quota est Gorgon fera!
 quis astra natus laudibus meruit suis
 ex te et noverca? quem tuli mundum peto.* 95

Give, Jupiter—but give me gods to guard:
 it will be granted you to pull your lightning from
 the part that I'll protect. Whether you bid me guard
 the icy pole or else the torrid zone,
 in this part know the gods themselves are safe.
 Paean Apollo earned temples in Cirrha and a home in heaven
 for one serpent slain¹²—O, how many a Python
 died in Hydra! Bacchus and Perseus have now
 joined the gods: but what a tiny region of the world
 the conquered East, how small a beast the Gorgon!
 Who born of you and of my stepmother has earned
 the stars by his own glory? I claim the universe I bore.

The major themes and tensions of the prologue are reprised here. Hercules begs a gift of Jupiter, but it turns out to be the privilege of protecting the gods themselves; there will be no further need of Jupiter's thunderbolts where Hercules stands guard. With this, he echoes his claim at the beginning of his speech to have brought peace to Jupiter and to have rendered his lightning and thunder superfluous. Hercules then reverts to his obsession with the successes of the other sons of Jupiter who have attained heaven: Apollo received a house there for slaying the Python, but the Hydra was a multitude of serpents; Bacchus and Perseus are among the gods, yet the eastern parts through which Bacchus travelled were small compared to those that Hercules traversed, and as for Perseus, "how small a beast the Gorgon!" (*quota est Gorgon fera!*, 96), recalling Hercules' earlier expression of contempt for his rival, "how small a fraction of me is Perseus?" (*pars quota est Perseus mei!*, 51). Perseus and Bacchus were the offspring of mortal mothers, and Apollo was the child of Jupiter and Leto, so all three may be said, like Hercules, to have Juno as their stepmother, and indeed Juno was spiteful toward them as well, though she was not so central a figure in their myths (her connection with Hercules is more evident in Greek, where

12 Apollo killed the Python at Delphi, where his oracle was then located (Cyrrrha is the port of Delphi); Bacchus journeyed as far as India; Perseus slew the Gorgon.

the name Hera is the first element in Heracles). In the final couplet of the apostrophe to Jupiter, before he turns to speak with Lichas and the action proper of the play begins, Hercules asks rhetorically whether any child of his father and stepmother has been worthy of the stars. The legitimate children of Jupiter and Juno were Mars, Vulcan, and Hebe.¹³ Hercules discounts any of these as rivaling his achievements: Hebe was the gods' cupbearer, and was given to Hercules as wife after he was divinized; the smith god Vulcan was lame; and Mars was a dubious figure, routed in the *Iliad* by Diomedes even though he was the god of war (*Iliad* 5.850–861). It is thus only by their lineage that these are deities, as opposed to Hercules who has earned divine status by his deeds. It is on this basis that he demands access to the universe he bore on his shoulders—the allusion is to the time he briefly relieved Atlas of his burden.

Hercules Oetaeus is far the longest of the Senecan tragedies, and no one will deny that it outdoes the rest in repetitiousness and fustian. It also deviates from the other eight more securely ascribed to Seneca in certain details of meter and diction, though whether these are decisive in treating it as spurious is still debated among specialists. I myself am inclined to see it as a rough draft from Seneca's own hand, which he would have trimmed and polished had he returned to it.¹⁴ But whether by Seneca or a highly talented imitator, the rhetoric is carefully crafted, and there is a density of texture that is designed to capture the complex personality and ambition of Hercules and likewise the traits of other characters in the drama. One needs to pay attention to the sudden shifts of subject, which are often mediated by implicit allusions or the multiple meanings of a word or phrase. Read this way, the logic of the discourse becomes clear, as does the richness of the characterization, and one may better appreciate the attraction of Senecan drama.

13 Sometimes other minor deities are called theirs, for example Eileithyia, the goddess of childbirth: cf. Hesiod, *Theogony*, 921.

14 Harrison (1999: 113–28) defends the authenticity of the *Hercules Oetaeus*, and its early date, by comparing connections with a series of epigrams attributed to Seneca (cf. esp. pp. 125–26).

Seneca on the Fall of Troy

George W.M. Harrison

Even if surviving versions of Greek plays are recognizable as templates for Roman early imperial tragedy, it is impossible to exaggerate the differences in social, religious and cultural conditions between late fifth century Athens and those of Neronian and Flavian Rome. The polyglot and aggressively multicultural nature of Senecan Rome is no more apparent than in the prominence of strong imperial women who served as models for female roles in his plays. This contribution focuses on how Hecuba and the chorus are positioned as a metaphor for the Fall of Troy, and its aftermath. Seneca's genius is proven by his two anonymous successors who see loss of identity in the *Octavia* and in the *Hercules Oetaeus*¹ as forming a bond among women more important than any other loyalties.

1 Destruction of Troy in Roman Republican Tragedy

The fall of Troy in Roman art and literature is a very large subject worthy of a monograph on its own.² The amount of art, such as the early imperial “tables” (*tabulae*), Campanian frescoes, plus graffiti, ensure that the topic permeated everyday life in Rome and Italy. It would thus be simplistic and misguided to assume that Euripides’ *Trojan Women* was the only source of inspiration for Seneca’s *Troas*. In between the two are at least two centuries of Roman treatment of the subject of the fall of Troy and its aftermath, about which we are sadly too ill-informed. The very first fragment in Ribbeck is from Livius

1 This contribution accepts that the *Hercules Oetaeus* is a work by an author active during the reign of Domitian. Critical opinion, as Konstan in this volume, is swinging back towards considering the *Herc. Oet.* as a first draft by Seneca which he did not live to revise. The implication of Konstan's position is that Seneca had to have been writing plays for performance up to the very end of his life.

All citations from *TrRF* for Livius Andronicus, Naevius and Ennius; otherwise fragments of Republican Latin from Ribbeck³. All other citations from the Oxford Classical Texts. All translations are those of the author.

2 Allison Keith, for example, examines the fall of Troy in the *Aeneid* and *Metamorphoses* in Bachvarova, Dutsch, and Suter's *Fall of Cities*.

Andronicus' *Aegisthus* (R³1.1–2 = *TrRF* 1.2.9),³ about the murder of Agamemnon upon his return from Troy before he could find out about the adultery between his natural cousin, Aegisthus, and his wife, Clytemnestra:⁴

nam ut Pergama
accensa et praeda per participes aequaliter
partiita est

For as Troy
has been destroyed and booty has been divided equally
among the participants

The final night of Troy would have been subject of Livius Andronicus' *Trojan Horse* (*Equos Troianus*; *TrRF* 1.2.14) for which one fragment of three lines in choral meter survives.⁵ More revealing is the brutality implicit in the line attributed to Naevius' *Equos Troianus* preserved by Macrobius:⁶

numquam hodie effugies quin mea manu moriari

There is no way you will flee today; rather, you die by my hand

3 The third edition of Ribbeck's (R³) *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta* published tragic fragments in its first volume (I) in 1897; a second volume on comic fragments was published in 1898. Ribbeck is now being superseded by W-W Ehlers, gen. ed., *Tragicorum romanorum fragmenta* (*TrRF*) [volume I = Livius Andronicus, Naevius, and *Tragici minores*; volume II = Ennius; other volumes in preparation].

For scholarship on individual Republican tragedians, cf. Manuwald 2010 appendix B: 207–10 to which should also be added Manuwald 2011.

4 For Livius Andronicus' plays on the Trojan War cycle, cf. Manuwald 2011: 191; Manuwald detects concern for the feelings of victims in this play, and an emphasis on fairness in Livius Andronicus' work as a whole.

Most of the passages on Republican tragedy in this contribution are also cited and translated in Erasmo 2004 whom the reader should also consult.

5 Discussion will be restricted on the whole to plays known to be about the Trojan War and its aftermath for which some fragments survive and are discussed in this contribution. For a full list, one is directed to the appendix in Manuwald (2010: 34–35). Cf. Manuwald in this volume for her appraisal of how scholars might examine fragments in Republican Latin relevant to the Trojan War.

6 Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 6.1.38 = R³1.14–15 = *TrRF* 1.3.13; I follow the reading in *TrRF*. Two lines of a third play on the *Trojan Horse* are preserved in Ribbeck among his *incertorum poetarum fabulae* (= *TrRF* 1.5.27 + F28 and F29; Cicero *Ad familiars* 7.1.2).

Presumably spoken by a Greek to a Trojan,⁷ the strong negative *numquam* is re-inforced by *quin*. The future active *effugies* assumes that the two combatants of this passage had met before. Nothing can be said about the original staging; more is known of the circumstances of the performance of the *Equos Troianus* at the inauguration of the Theater of Pompey in 55 BC in which infantry and cavalry acted on stage the conflagration of the city.⁸ Conflagration was already implicit in a line from Ennius' *Alexander* (i.e., Paris) in which Helen is described as one of the Furies (R³I.7.56 = *TrRF* II.151.18):⁹

Quo iudicio, Lacedaemonia mulier, Furiarum una, adveniet.

As a result of which judgment, the Lacedaemonian wife, one of the Furies, will come.

The judgment alluded to must be the Judgment of Paris and the Spartan woman must equally be Helen. In literature and art, the Furies generally brandish firebrands, such as they wave at Orestes in Aeschylus and which are a sign of destruction in general.¹⁰

7 Although one does not admit of certainty since even as Troy was stormed, so Vergil *Aeneid* 2, Aeneas and the soldiers who rallied around him killed many Greeks.

8 Erasmo (2004: 86–91). Cicero, *Ad fam.* (M. Marius) 7.1.2, did not record whether it was the *Equos Troianus* of Livius Andronicus or Naevius. Cicero in *Pro Sestio* and *Tusculan Disputations* is our main source for Republican tragedy in performance; the majority of fragments are preserved as lexical oddities in the grammarians Sextus Pompeius Festus (probably second century AD) in his epitome of the 20 volume work of Verrius Flaccus, in Nonius Marcellus (early fourth century AD) and in discussions in Varro's *De lingua latina*.

9 Manuwald in *TrRF* II places this line among *incerta* of Ennius. Cicero *De div* 1.114, the source of the quotation, gave no attribution; cp. Manuwald's fuller discussion in *TrRF* II (Ennius): 292–300.

It is not just modern students, but the Romans themselves needed reminding that Paris was the same as Alexander, as explained in Ennius' *Alexander* (R³I.5.38 = *TrRF* II.16): *qua propter "Parim" pastores nunc "Alexandrum" vocant* (for which reason shepherds now call "Paris" "Alexander").

10 The anonymous author of the *Octavia*, set in the reign of Nero but performed in my view during the reign of Domitian, several times equates the torches at Octavia's wedding to Nero as funereal and Agrippina, in her appearance to Poppaea in a dream sequence, positions herself as an avenging fury of her own murder, complete with torches.

Curiously, the Furies are not handmaidens of Justice: Orestes is acquitted in Aeschylus' *Eumenides* and the Furies have to be mollified with an euphemism; Poppaea does prevail over Octavia for Nero's affections; Juno out of pique sends the Fury Megaera to drive Hercules mad, and most famously a fury forces the dead Tantalus to spread his contagion

Categorizing Helen as a Fury, however, clearly places sympathy with the Trojans or, at a minimum, reflects the Greeks in a bad light. This is hardly surprising since classical Greek (i.e., Athenian) tragedy of the Trojan cycle has much unflattering to say about Greeks. Anti-Greek sentiment, which is not quite the same thing as pro-Trojan, is frequently met in Republican Roman drama.¹¹ Helen, again, is singled out in Ennius' *Iphigeneia* (R³I.6.195–196 = *TrRF* I.5.124),¹² Agamemnon speaking to Menelaus:

Pro malefactis Helena redeat, virgo pereat innocens?
Tua reconcilietur uxor, mea necetur filia?

[That] Helen may answer for [her] misdeeds, should an innocent virgin die?

[That] your wife may be returned, should my daughter be killed?

Translation cannot do justice to the natural pauses after the second element of internal rhyme in both lines: *redeat* . . . *pereat* adds to Helen's opprobrium and *reconcilietur* . . . *necetur* establishes that of Menelaus. The effect of placement at the end of the rhetorical questions is to emphasize the *innocens* of Iphigeneia and her position as *filia* of Agamemnon. Helen was an ambiguous figure in Greek tragedy, as reflected in several plays by Euripides in which she is a character. Roman tradition was more broadly condemnatory as seen in the just quoted passages and in her appearance in Seneca's *Troas* 861–1008 in which she subverts her assignment to fetch Polyxena to pitch, incredibly, that she has suffered as much as the Trojan women. Ulysses, who comes to collect Astyanax in Seneca's *Troas* 524–813, was familiar on the Greek and Roman

to Atreus at the beginning of Seneca's *Thyestes* (for which cf. esp. Erasmo 2004: 101–17). Furies also occur in Ennius' *Alcmeo* (*TrRF* 11.12) and Ennius' *Eumenides* (*TrRF* 11.52–55).

11 Much that would have been written here on the Roman, as opposed to Greek, perspective of events surrounding the Trojan War has been anticipated by Manuwald (2011, esp. 133–37 and 282–92), with which I am in agreement.

12 The editors of *TrRF* have removed the attribution to Ennius and placed this fragment in their *adespota*, adding at the beginning of the citation a line not in Ribbeck: *ego proiec-tor quod tu peccas; tu delinquis, ego arguor* ("I cover up because you screwed up; you do wrong, I am convicted"). I render *proiecto* with the force of a middle, which makes more sense with the *quod*.

For fragments of Ennius' *Iphigeneia*, cf. *TrRF* 11.82–88.

stage for his duplicity. In Accius' *Deiphobus* (R³1.4.131–132), for example, some one addresses Ulysses:¹³

aut, infandod homine, gnatu Laerta, Ithacensi exsule,
qui neque amico amicus umquam gravis neque hosti hostis fuit.

or, unspeakable cur, son of Laertes, exile from Ithaca,
who was neither a reliable friend to a friend nor enemy to an enemy.

Ulysses himself in *Odyssey* 8. 517–520 recalled that the hardest fighting when Troy was stormed was around the house of Deiphobus, and so the subject of this play could have involved the hand-to-hand fighting in the streets of Troy.

Anti-Greek sentiment is not surprising since most known Republican tragedies were composed during the Macedonian Wars (214 BC–205 BC; 200 BC–196 BC; 172 BC–168 BC; 150 BC–148 BC), Seleucid War (192 BC–188 BC), and Achaean War (146 BC) through which Rome secured territorial hegemony over Greece. A similar tone is discerned in other Roman Republican tragedies of the Trojan cycle, such as Accius' *Diomedes* (R³1.1.270),¹⁴ and Accius' *Nyctegresia* (R³1.9.491) on the night-time mission of Diomedes and Ulysses to steal the Palladium from Troy.¹⁵ Even as playwrights were adapting Greek plays, they were adopting, or inserting, unflattering views of the Greeks, such as Accius'

13 Erasmio (2004: 44–45) cites a second fragment from the same play that might indicate Ulysses' mendacity.

Ulysses might be the person referred to in Ennius' *Hecuba* (R³1.4.165–67 = *TrRF* 11.73):
haec tu etsi perverse dices, facile Achivos flexeris:
nam opulenti cum locuntur partier atque ignobiles
eadem dicta eademque oratio aequa non aequae valet.

Although you will speak dishonestly, you easily will have convinced the Achaeans:
for when the mighty say the same things in the same way as poor men
the same speeches do not carry the same weight.

14 *tyranni saevom ingenium atque exercrabile* (the savage and inexcusable savagery of a tyrant). Compare also in the same play (R³1.12.283–84) Diomedes' wish to return to Argos because he was not shown respect at Troy: *ergo med Argos referam, nam hic sum ignobilis, ne cui cognoscar noto.*

15 *tun quod superset socium mittis leti? an lucti paenitet?* (Do you send what is left of the allies to death? Or, does grief cause repentance?).

Epigoni based on (one assumes) Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes*.¹⁶ One line is preserved (R³1.3.288):

Et nonne Argivos fremere bellum et velle vim vulgum vides?

Do you not see that Argives growl for war and the people wish violence?

In the context of the play, it would have been hurled by one faction against the other but over-all it describes the Republican—that is, anterior to and different from Juvenal's jibe—attitude to Greeks.

Numerous plays on the Trojan War cycle are known which, although not about the fall of Troy, may preserve lines that look forward to the fall of Troy, if part of the “back story”, or look back in time to its destruction. At a minimum they inform the context in which Seneca and his audience came to the story when his *Troas* was produced; several of the preserved quotations are close enough to lines or scenes in Seneca that they could be argued to be the source of reminiscences. For example, in the beginning of Seneca's *Troas*, Hecuba considers Priam fortunate to be dead, an inversion of a line from an unknown play of Pacuvius (R³1.28.391):¹⁷

Priamus, si adesset, ipse eius commiseresceret.

Priam, if he had been present, would himself have pitied him.

Nonius (233.16) glossed *animatus* in Accius' *Sailing of the Fleet* (*Epinausimache*)¹⁸ to mean “whipped into fury” and cited the line *ut nunc, cum animatus iero, satis armatus sum* (as now, when I will have been whipped into fury, I am armed enough; R³1.1.308). More interesting is the two-line quote that fixes the naval action at Troy and thus should be considered a reminiscence of the speaker (R³1.12.322–323):

16 Erasmio (2004: 2–3) draws a distinction between *aemulatio* and *imitatio*, to which Romans added *iudicium* (their own view point/sensibility); *contaminatio* (15) is the third major way that Romans re-acted to and re-shaped Greek texts.

17 Quoted by Servius *ad Aen.* 11.259. Ribbeck (1³.33) thought that Servius *ad Aen.* 2.506 discussed a different play by Pacuvius, one on the death of Priam in which Priam was beheaded at the tomb of Achilles at Sigeum, his head placed on the tomb and his body left at the shore.

18 For fuller discussion of this play, cf. Manuwald (2006).

O father, o fatherland, o house of Priam,
 temple demarcated by high-sounding pivots!
 I see you [the palace = *domus*], while foreign tribute is visible,
 with roofs carved, filigreed,
 inlaid with gold, ivory, fit for a king.
 I see all these things in flames,
 life de-lifed from Priam by force
 the altar of Jupiter stenchd in blood.

Starting with self-pity, Andromache quickly recalls images of the destruction of the palace and other buildings within Troy contrasting the *ops* (here, I think, equivalent to “tribute” from subject peoples, and not as more generally later “resources” = “wealth”).²⁰ In the next fragment in Ribbeck “strength” seems to be what Andromache understands in her address to Hector (*ex opibus summis, opis egens, Hector, tuae*; from the greatest material well being, [we are] needing, Hector, of your strength; R³1.10.89 = *TrRF* 11.23.3). Later in the play Andromache picks up the threads of her recollection (R³1.12.91–93 = *TrRF* 11.23.1–2 and *TrRF* 11.179):

Vidi videre quod sum passa aegerrume:
 Hectorem curru quadriugo raptarier,
 Hectoris natum de muro iactarier

I see what I have endured to see in the greatest distress:
 Hector being dragged behind a four-horse chariot,
 Hector’s son being thrown from the wall

The present in *vidi* and in the two present infinitives indicate that the horror for her is still alive; the continuation of the true perfect *sum passa* makes it clear that the hurt can never go away. First and foremost for a Roman audience,

20 Cicero *Tusc. Disp.* 3.19.44 is our source for R³1.9, 10, and 12 in which he warned Brutus about trusting too much in good fortune. Andromache was his main example and the *ops* (“strength”) of Hector was the guarantee of her good luck. Manuwald in *TrRF* 11.23 has greatly revised the order of the fragments from Ribbeck, and has removed *Hectoris natum de Troiano muro iactari* from this play and placed it among *incerta* (fr. 179).

For the range of meanings of *ops*, cf. *OLD* 1258 coll 2–3.

Andromache's open wound was Astyanax, not Hector.²¹ Andromache addresses Astyanax in Naevius' *Andromacha* (R³I.1.1–2 = *TrRF* I.3.1):²²

Quod tu, mi gnatē, quaeso ut in pectus tuum
demittas, tamquam in fiscinam vindemitor.

But you, my son, I ask that you place [this]
in your heart, just as a grape picker in his basket.

The context in this play cannot be known but Ulysses' fear (524–555, 736–738) and Andromache's hope (470–474 *et passim*) in Seneca's *Troas* is that as long as Astyanax is alive Troy cannot be thought to have fallen.

The thirteen surviving fragments of Accius' *Astyanax* are enough to establish general outlines of the plot and show that tragedy was moving towards a pro-Trojan interpretation of the Trojan War. R³I.1.164 establishes the thoroughness of the destruction of Troy:²³

Qui nostra per vim patria populavit bona.

Who stripped bare through violence the property from our country.

Republican fondness for alliteration and metrical concerns are not enough to explain the ablative *patria* instead of *civitate*, especially as Ennius' historical drama, *Ambracia*, preserves a fragment in which the countryside is being looted.²⁴ The separation of *nostra*—*patria*—*bona* so that they stretch across

21 On mourning by Hecuba and Andromache for Hector in the *Iliad*, cf. Erasmo (2012: 20); the scene in Homer is without parallel in surviving Roman Republican tragedy.

22 Attributed to Naevius by Servius on Vergil *ad Geor.* 1.266.

Naevius also wrote a *Hector proficiscens* (Manuwald 2011: 203–204), which is perhaps of more interest to a discussion of Hercules as the Stoic *proficiscens* in Seneca's *Hercules furens* and the anonymous *Hercules Oetaeus*.

23 Sacking of enemy camps is implicit in Accius' *Aeneadae sive Decius* (Erasmo 2004: 68–71) but especially fr. 12 in Ribbeck's editon: *castra haec vestra est: optume essis meritis a nobis* (this camp is yours: you merit the best [things] from us). This translation assumes that the adverb *optume* = *bona*; for a different translation, cf. Erasmo (2004: 71). Both Naevius' *Clastidium* and Ennius' *Ambracia* were about cities captured by the Roman army (Erasmo 2004: 110). For a broader discussion of destruction of cities in Roman historical drama on the Republican stage, cf. Erasmo (2004: 69–80) and Ginsberg in this volume.

24 Quoted and discussed by Erasmo 2004: 73: [*iam*] *agros audaces depopulant servi domino- rum domi* ([already] at home emboldened slaves are looting the fields of their masters). A natural interpretation is that when Ambracia fell, as the Roman army was sacking the

the entire line can be taken to indicate that the entire country was looted, not just the city of Troy. The theme of Greek greed is continued in R³I.4.169–170:²⁵

Nil credo auguribus, qui auris verbis divitant
alienas suas ut locupletent domos.

I do not trust diviners, who enrich others' ears
with omens (*verbis*) so that they might gorge their own homes.

In Accius' *Astyanax*, as in Seneca, the natural world is a more impartial and permanent observer. R³I.12.185–186 seems to anthropomorphize the city of Troy:

Troia est testis: quaere ex aliis, qui illius miseritudine
nomen clarum in humili saxo multis memorant vocibus.

Troy is a witness: ask others who in many sentiments
recall [its] name, famous for its misery, [now] a low-lying rock.

"Misery" is synonymous with Troy and its survivors. *Miserere, mater* (take pity [on me], mother, 792) are the only words spoken by Astyanax in Seneca's *Troas* and come at the moment when he is about to be led to his death. A similar sentiment is expressed in Accius' *Astyanax* (R³I.13.187–188) at perhaps at the moment when Astyanax is about to throw himself off the one remaining tower of Troy:

Abducite intro: nam mihi miseritudine
commovit animum excelsa aspecti²⁶ dignitas.

Go inside: in my misery the noble
impressiveness of the vista has moved [my] soul.

city, slaves fleeing to the countryside took advantage of the opportunity to steal what they could.

25 For discussion of this passage, cf. Erasmo (2004: 43–44). One assumes a great influence of Accius' *Astyanax* on the central part of Seneca's *Troas* since the intersection of greed and rhetoric was a central theme of much of Seneca's writing; on Accius in general, cf. Manuwald and S. Faller (2002).

26 For case, cf. *OLD aspectus*; the meaning given for Accius (R³I. 80^a) in *aspectus* 4b probably does not fit well here.

“Pity” also moves the speaker in Pacuvius’ *Iliona*, which takes its name from the eldest daughter of Priam and Hecuba, who was married to Polymester, the Thracian king into whose safety Polydorus, the youngest son of Priam and Hecuba, was entrusted:²⁷

mater, te appelo, tu quae curam somno suspensam levas
neque te mei miseret, surge et sepeli natum [tuum]

I call on you, mother, you who lightens care suspended in sleep,
do not pity me [but] get up and bury [your] child

As its highest-ranking survivor, Hecuba represents the fallen Troy. She is the person who mourns most and is most to be pitied, a dubious honor she insists on. She leads the mourning, a position the chorus in Seneca’s *Troas* acknowledges, but also seems apparent from a line in a tragedy of Scaevus Memor, whose title is unknown (*TrRF* 1.4 Scaevus Memor 1):

Scindimus atras veteri planctu,
Cissei, genas

We tear our cheeks black with long-established
beating, Cissei [ie., Hecuba]

Hecuba would reasonably have been the protagonist or central character in several Republican plays: Accius’ *Hecuba* is known only from a reference in Priscian (6.716) and his *Trojan Women* is known only from Servius’ comment on *Aeneid* 1.179. She makes her bid for priority of suffering even as Troy is still under attack (Ennius’ *Hecuba*; R³1.3.164 = *TrRF* 11.78):

Heu me miserum! interii: pergunt²⁸ lavere sanguen sanguine

27 For a discussion of this passage, cf. Manuwald (2000: 301–14) and Erasmo (2004: 35–36). The marriage of Iliona to Polymester explains why Polydorus was sent to him. Hecuba’s revenge upon learning of the murder of Polydorus is told in Euripides’ *Hecuba*. Pacuvius’ *Cisseis*, based on a play by Euripides, so R³1 *incert. fab.* 34 (= *TrRF* 1.5.26), fills in the back-story that Hecuba was named Cisseis when she grew up as the daughter of the king of Thrace. Problems persist since the fragments of Euripides’ *Archelaos* (*TrGF* 228–64) need not intersect with a play by Pacuvius whose existence is still doubted by some scholars.

28 The present *pergunt*, best rendered by the present participial “are running”, is taken to imply that the city is at that moment, whether in dramatic action or a remembrance, being stormed, which contrasts with Hecuba’s perfect *interii*. Of the three possible trans-

How miserable I am! I am dead: [the Greeks] are running around to bathe blood with blood

Quintilian (9.3.77) quotes a line (R³I *incert. auct. incert. fab.* 9.21 = *TrRF* 1.5.107) more striking in its starkness than even Lavinia's blush in Vergil (*Aeneid* 12.64–69):

Hecuba hoc dolet, pudet, piget

Hecuba mourns, is ashamed about, is annoyed at this

This tricolon defines Hecuba well, too, in her exchange with her daughter Cassandra in Ennius' *Alexander* (R³1.6.39–53 = *TrRF* 11.151.1–15):²⁹

{Hec.} Sed quid oculis rabere visa es derepente ardentibus?
Ubi illa [tua] paulo ante sapiens virginali modestia? 40

{Cas.} Mater, optumarum multo mulier melior mulierum,
missa sum superstitiosis ariolationibus:
namque Apollo fatis fandis dementem invitam ciet.
Virgines aequalis vereor, patris mei meum factum **pudet**,
optumi viri. Mea mater, tui me **miseret**, mei **piget**: 45
optumam progeniem Priamo peperisti extra me: hoc **dolet**:
men obesse, illos prodesse, me obstare, illos obsequi!

adest, adest fax obvoluta sanguine atque incendio!
multos annos latuit: cives, ferte opem et restinguite!
{vox Apol.} Iamque mari magno classis cita 50
texitur: exitium examen rapit:
advenit, et fera velivolantibus
navibus complevit manus litora

{Hec.} But what have you seen that you suddenly are frenzied with
burning eyes?

Where is she, just a moment ago wise in her virginal modesty? 40

lations, "I died", "I have died", or "I am dead", the continuous perfect seems preferable to the instantaneous perfect.

29 Manuwald in *TrRF* 11 removes the attribution to Ennius' *Alexander* and places it among the *incerta*.

{Cas.} Mother, a wife better by much than all the best wives,
 I have been sent with superstitious prophecies:
 for Apollo forces me unwillingly into madness to speak the
 future.
 I fear for [Trojan women] equally virgins, my action shames my
 father,
 the best of men. My mother, pity me, be annoyed at me: 45
 you have, other than me, born the best child to Priam: be sad
 for this:
 don't hinder me, help them, oppose me, follow them!

It comes; the torch comes wrapped in blood and fire!
 It hid for many years: citizens, rally round, put it out!
 {voice Apollo} Already a swift fleet crosses the great 50
 sea: the swarm carries along destruction:
 it approaches and the expedition has filled
 the wild shore with swift-sailing ships.

The passage is quoted and praised by Cicero in *De divinatione* 1.31.66–67 in which the last four lines are cited as an oracle from Apollo spoken through Cassandra (*deus inclusus corpore humano iam, non Cassandra loquitur*, §67). The scene belongs to the time when the Greek fleet is still crossing the Aegean, but even so Hecuba can see in Cassandra's eyes (*ardentibus*, 39) the torches (*fax*, 48) that will burn Troy. Cassandra knows in advance the mourning (*miseret*, 45, and *dolet*, 46) that will be Hecuba's role, as well as the anger (*piget*, 45) and shame (*pudet*, 44), although the shame at this point is apportioned to Priam. The lines after the break in Cicero start with two lines spoken by Cassandra as she is seized with divine rapture, in which the end of Troy is clearly seen, followed by a four-line oracle given by Apollo through her.

In the same work (*De divinatione* 1.21.42), Cicero cited, as an example of visions that came during sleep, the famous fire-brand prophecy seen by Hecuba and related to Priam (*R³ incert. auct. incert. fab. 5.5–16 = TrRF 1.5.76*):

[...] mater gravida parere se ardentem facem
 visa est in somnis Hecuba: quo fato pater
 rex ipse Priamus somnio, mentis metu
 percussus, curis sumptus suspirantibus,
 ecsacrificabat hostiis balantibus.
 Tum coniecturam postulat pacem petens,
 ut se edoceret obsecrans Apollinem,

quo sese vertant tantae sortes somnium.
 Ibi ex oraculo voce divina edidit
 Apollo puerum, primus Priamo qui foret 10
 postilla natus, temperaret tollere:
 eum esse exitium Troiae, pestem Pergamo.

[...] Hecuba dreamed a firebrand
 revealed itself to her, pregnant: because of this omen
 King Priam, roused from sleep by fear in his mind,
 consumed by breath-taking cares,
 was sacrificing bleeting victims.
 Then, seeking peace, he asked for a sign,
 so that, reverencing Apollo, he could inform himself
 how such great visions could turn sleep [away from] them.
 then Apollo in an oracle with a divine voice
 said that Priam should decline to raise the boy,
 who was about to be [born] to him soon afterwards:
 he would be the destruction of Troy, a pox to Pergamum.

For the ancients, the oracle of the birth of Paris explains why he was exposed by Priam as a newborn child. Fire (*facem*, 1) is the form the dream chose to take, linking itself to Troy.³⁰ In a very real sense, Hecuba started mourning Troy even before Paris was born.

2 A Director's Dream

Quis enim est, qui meum nomen nuncupat? (Who is it, who calls my name?) asks Aeneas in a line cited by Varro in his work on the Latin language (*De lingua latina* 6.60 = R³I *incert. auct. incert fab Aenea* 1.1 = *TrRF* 1.5.89). It is appropriate to call Aeneas' name when turning attention to Seneca but not because he was a character in Seneca's play; rather, the Trojan *fato profugus* (*Aeneid* 1.2) was a figure from Latin Republican tragedy who crossed genre boundaries, at least by the time of Seneca and doubtless due in part to the prestige of Vergil and Ovid. Seneca's great tragic rival, Pomponius Secundus (*TrRF* 1.4. *testimonia et fragmenta*), wrote a historical drama on Aeneas, implicitly treating Aeneas as an historical figure and not a

30 Agrippina appears with torches in a dream to Poppaea in the *Octavia*; on the relationship between torches and tragedy, see Slater in this volume p. 303 n. 33.

mythological one. Tacitus, *Annales* 11.13, stated that an unnamed play of Pomponius Secundus' (*is carmina scaenae dabit*), produced at some point after his consulate (*consularem*), was jeered down by the crowd (*theatralem populi lascivam... probra*). The production can be dated to the end of AD 47, that is, just a few months before Seneca was returned from eight years of exile on Corsica.³¹

Several of the surviving tragedies of Euripides end with the chorus and/or main characters embarking on boats,³² including his *Trojan Women*, the most distant identifiable source of inspiration for Seneca's *Troas*.³³ Composed and produced around AD 54, the final year of Claudius' reign,³⁴ the question for Seneca's play must be whether the Trojan women, assigned as booty to the Greeks, look forward or look back as they leave the stage into the orchestra, where there may, or may not, have been props representing boats.³⁵ There is substantial evidence for choral entrance and exit through the orchestra in Roman imperial theatre.³⁶ It resonates whether the women are more afraid of

-
- 31 The rivalry might well have been more than just literary. Dating of political, and other, honors would seem to assign Pomponius Secundus to the court faction around Messalina while Seneca clearly was a favorite of Agrippina. Pomponius Secundus apparently had considerable skills and trust; his military governorship of Upper Germany (CE 50–CE 51) belongs to a period after the death of Messalina.
- 32 Euripides *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, *Trojan Women*, *Helen*, *Iphigeneia at Tauris*, and also satyr drama *Cyclops*. By contrast only the *Philoctetes* of the surviving plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles ends with embarkation. Seneca's *Troas* is his only play that ends at sea to which one should add the *incertus auctor*, *Octavia*.
- 33 A *Troades* by Accius is known but only by title. Titles of other Republican tragedies are attested which could have been more immediate sources of inspiration, such as *Andromacha*, *Astyanax*, *Equus Troianus*, and *Hecuba*. Scholarship (e.g., Goldberg 2000) has suspected that Accius' *Thyestes* was more important to Seneca than Sophocles' *Atreus* or Euripides' *Thyestes*.
- 34 For title and date, cf. *infra* section II. For dating of the plays, cf. Nisbet (1990) but now Marshall (2014: 33–44).
- 35 For boats in a flooded orchestra in Flavian and later Rome, cf. Harrison (2000), a surmise now credited by Coleman in her edition of Martial's *Liber de Spectaculis* (2006: 212–214). The problem of physically having small boats in the orchestra is not insurmountable but equally boats can be suggested by choral movement as was done in a workshop conducted by Peter Meineck (Saskatoon 1998) in which I participated.
- 36 For a discussion of what a Roman audience may or may not have been expected to take away from a performance, cf. Cowan (2013). The major study of choral entrances and exits in Seneca remains that of Davis (1993).

the future than mournful of the past. The answer further cannot be a simple one, and directors over the *millennia* could have made a number of choices in their productions.³⁷

Hecuba starts the play alone on the stage and, in my reading of the play, it ends with her alone with the messenger, as the members of the chorus are escorted off stage one by one. Surviving Greek drama invariably ends with the chorus on stage and, with the exception of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* and *Prometheus Bound* and Sophocles' *Trachiniae*, the chorus speaks the last lines of the play.³⁸ Senecan practice differs from that of his Greek models: normally his plays are composed in five acts separated by four choral odes. In his *Hercules Furens*, *Medea*, and *Agamemnon* there is nothing for the chorus to do on stage after their final ode, and in his *Oedipus*, the leader of the chorus brings to Oedipus' attention, or, rather, to ours, the entry of Jocasta (1004–1009) and then announces her death (1040–1041). In Seneca's *Thyestes*, it is dramatically necessary that the stage be all but emptied after the fourth choral ode (789–1112) so that Atreus and Thyestes alone on stage amplifies the horror of Thyestes being fed his own children.

37 As always, one must be careful to distinguish where one is attempting to reconstruct the conditions of the original production, or is considering how a play might reflect the time and place of revivals. Two illustrative examples: the vases depicting drama in T.B.L. Webster's pioneering studies and in Taplin's *Pots and Plays* are largely South Italian and so, if they reflect performance, they record details of revivals. Second, Griffith (2005) and Roisman (2005) on Euripides' *Alceste* might seem at first sight to promote different views; the former, however, tried to reconstruct the original performance for an Athenian male citizen audience while the latter looked to how the ending could have been played in subsequent performance.

Seneca's *Troas* is the most performed of his plays in the last 100 years attesting to its ability to remain always contemporary. Information courtesy of Naomi Setchell of the Archive for the Performance of Greek and Roman Drama (APGRD), to whom the author expresses his thanks.

38 More often than not, the last lines of Greek tragedies are curt observations by the chorus on the mutability of the human condition. In Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, Clytemnestra steals the last two lines of the play from the chorus, who had just spoken while Prometheus remains defiant, interacting with Hermes and the chorus. In Sophocles' *Trachiniae*, Hyllus, surviving son of Heracles, is given the last fifteen lines of the play, most of which are directed to his male companions (*opadoi*, 1264) but the last four lines of the play are directed to the *parthen'* (1275), proving that the chorus had remained on stage.

Thanks are owed to David Slavitt and to the Johns Hopkins University Press for permission to use, pre-publication, Slavitt's new translation of the plays of Sophocles.

What separates Seneca from the Athenian playwrights, however, is not so much the presence or absence of the chorus but the popularity of pantomime, a Roman performative genre in which even Augustus delighted. The history and influence of pantomime is now better understood due to the efforts of Hall and of Wyles, working individually and in collaboration.³⁹ Dutsch recently, and provocatively, published an article that took as its point of departure remarks of Quintilian on gestures appropriate for the would-be lawyer-statesman to learn.⁴⁰ Quintilian was a younger contemporary of Seneca and it is not implausible to consider that if pantomime gesture was making its way into the law courts, it must similarly have influenced dramatic performance. This would explain why Seneca had a fondness for assigning what in Greek tragedy would have been messenger speeches to principal roles. In the *Hercules Furens*, for example, Theseus gives a long speech on how Hercules rescued him from the underworld (650–839, with interrupting questions by Amphitryon until 761). As an eyewitness of the events he relates he could have remembered the intensity of the moment with suitable gestures not as appropriate for retelling by a third party. Dramatically, and visually, it could have been striking for the chorus or non-speaking characters (*mutae personae*) to act out what was being said. In the *Hercules Oetaeus*, the death of Hercules is not enacted as in Sophocles' version, the *Trachiniae*, but Philoctetes, who lit the pyre and received Hercules' bow in return, describes (1609–1757) the death. Given the visual spectacle of Roman drama, it would be reasonable to have the chorus performing with gesture the building of the pyre for Hercules and his death.⁴¹ Seneca's *Phaedra* requires that the chorus remain on stage to help Theseus collect the dismembered parts of his son, Hippolytus, whose death Theseus had unjustly brought about. At 1244–1246, the chorus directs Theseus in the imperative to perform

39 For bibliography on Hall and Wyles, see their contributions to Harrison and Liapis (2013) as well as Petrides in the same volume. Zanobi (2014) has just published a book length study on the intersection of Senecan drama and pantomime. On Zanobi, cf. Baertschi in this volume and Harrison's review in *JRS* (2015).

40 Dutsch (2013: 409–31).

41 The leader of the chorus prods Philoctetes' account by asking him several questions (1609–1610, 1613, 1617). When Philoctetes flags, the leader of the chorus puts another question (1691–1692). The chorus must be on stage for the speech of Philoctetes as they speak the final lines of the play (1983–1996), and it is unlikely that they stood still.

Roman tragedy was always more visual and the chorus was a much more active participant in the action. For Republican spectacle, which was elaborated further during the empire, cf. Cowen (2013); for spectacle of imperial theatre, cf. Beacham (1999: 4–11, 233–237).

last rites for Hippolytus (*iusta nato solve*) and bury him (*absconde*). Theseus then points out mangled pieces of his son (*huc, huc*, 1247) to collect, also in the imperative, but now the plural *vehite* (1247) ... *date* (1248) ... *patefacite* (1275) ... *apparate* (1277) ... *inquire* (1279). Lines 1271–1274 spoken by Theseus indicate a pyre is being built. Such can be left to the imagination, but much more striking if the chorus mimes the action.⁴²

Choral presence on stage at the end of Seneca's *Troas* and their unspoken movements and gestures add extra *colour*⁴³ to the horror of having to be witness to the dissolution of their world. The fourth choral ode begins its first two lines (1009, 1010) with *dulce* plus present participles, invoking language Horace used of his beloved (*Odes* 1.22.23–24): *dulce ridentem Lalagen amabo/ dulce loquentem*. But instead of laughter and light chat, their fate is mourning (*maerenti*) and tears (*dolentum*). They are aware that the one consolation in grief for women—that is, to grieve together—will be denied them (1025–1028) and they fear that most of them will perish in shipwrecks (1030–1033). The chorus opines that their last sight will be the receding smoke of Troy: *Troes hoc signo patriam videbunt* are the last lines they speak in the play (1050–1055).

This ode sets up the final act in which a messenger tells Hecuba and Andromache of the deaths of Polyxena, daughter of Hecuba, and Astyanax, son of Andromache. The death of Astyanax is described first (1068–1103). Brought up the last standing tower of Troy, Astyanax leapt before he could be thrown. The assembled Greeks and their leaders are described in close enough detail that the chorus, which must be present on stage, could effectively have conveyed the action in gestures and motion. The horror is so terrible that the messenger is incapable of completing the last line of his description (1103). The death of Polyxena follows (1118–1164). Similar to Iphigeneia, the human

42 For the ending of the *Phaedra*, cf. Mario Erasmio (2008). I am grateful to him for sharing with me some of his further insights.

In the 2003 Cincinnati production, the satyr chorus of Euripides' *Cyclops* mimes that action of Odysseus' crew preparing the stake to blind Polyphemus. The warrant for this stage action is implicit in the prior scene in which the satyrs feign injuries in order not to expose themselves to danger; cf. Harrison (2005: 237–58).

43 Senecan *color* is his need, and ability, to make external what is internal to the character and the scene (Hook 2000: 60 *et passim*). Although Hook restricts his discussion largely to how color, a term taken from rhetoric, is used to suggest "the ineluctable idea of character" (Mamet, quoted by Hook 2000: 66), I would argue that color can be used to make manifest externally what is internal to an entire scene. It is not without significance that the greatest number of examples of *colores* in rhetoric come from the two handbooks of reminiscences that Seneca the Elder prepared at the request of his sons.

sacrifice was wrapped up as a wedding.⁴⁴ As a bride for the dead Achilles (in myth also the intended spouse for Iphigeneia), however, she needed to be dead herself. Neoptolemus, son of Achilles and officiant, is contrasted to Polyxena, and the assembled Greeks and Trojans both weep for Polyxena, although the Greeks do so more and more openly. Once again, choral movement could have conveyed Polyxena's humanity in the midst of so much brutality.

Neither Hecuba nor Andromache comment; both are stunned initially to silence. Hecuba recovers and orders (1165–1177) Greeks who must have been nearby to go and get ready to sail (*ite, ite . . . petite*).⁴⁵ Her appraisal is succinct: *concidit virgo et puer* (a young woman and a young boy have fallen, 1167).⁴⁶ And she returns to the questions that have been foremost to her from the beginning of the play: where and how will she mourn; where and how will she die. In her shock in her last lines, one has a glimmer of what now is called “survivor’s guilt” (1171–1177). Hecuba cannot comprehend how she has managed to survive. The entire night that Troy fell she sought death but death did not come for her. She stood next to those who burnt to death; she stood next to Priam when he was killed (*quam prope a Priamo steti*, 1177). Almost reluctantly, the messenger follows up with the last two lines of the play (1178–1179):

*repetite celeri maria, captivae, gradu:
iam vela puppis laxat et classis movet.*

seek the shore quickly, captives:
already ships let loose the sails and the fleet moves out.

The messenger’s language, directed to the captive Trojan women, is similar to that Hecuba directed to the Greeks. Hecuba inserted herself as an authority

44 Comparisons and contrasts with Euripides’ *Iphigeneia at Aulis* are obvious. Pompeian frescoes of the death of Iphigeneia are closely contemporary to Seneca’s *Troas*.

45 The scene has a parallel in the end of the Aeschylus’ *Suppliants* where the chorus of Argive soldiers accompanies the chorus of Danaids off stage. Seneca in his *Phaedra* (*supra*), probably the earliest of his surviving plays, had already put on stage one group of male companions (*mutae personae*) of Theseus who lead off stage the chorus of Athenian women.

46 Both literally and metaphorically correct since *concido*, to fall together, describes the result but also how they died—Astyanax went down from the tower and much is made of how Polyxena fell to the ground preserving her modesty.

figure over the Greeks even in her grief and powerlessness; perhaps, it is her powerlessness and suffering that has ceded the moral high ground to her.⁴⁷

3 *Troas* or Τρωιάδες

Didaskalia, the official inscription recording by year and in order of place the trilogies presented at the dramatic festival in honour of Dionysos, show that Euripides' *Trojan Women* was first performed in March, 415 BC, a few months following Athens' reduction of Melos in which all male citizens were put to death, and women and children were sold into slavery.⁴⁸ There was reason to believe that Athens in reprisal would suffer the same fate if captured by Sparta. Phyrinchos had been fined in 493 BC for his production of a play on the *Sack of Miletus* (494 BC) in the Ionian Revolt "for reminding [the Greeks] of their misfortune" (Herodotus 6.21.10). Because of Athenian triumphalism over their sack of Melos, soon to disappear in the disastrous Sicilian expedition, Euripides' play could be performed without censure. For those in the audience, however, fifteen years into an already costly struggle with Sparta, Euripides' trilogy of 415 BC would have had resonance since the fate of the men *could* be their fates and the enslavement of the Trojan women was a real possibility for their own families. Euripides' care in distinguishing the concern of the chorus of Trojan women by age is brilliant and chilling: the younger women wonder about their potential sexual exploitation, while the older women focus more on humiliation. Although societies in moments of triumph think themselves invincible what was presented on stage was something that the audience would have had recent experience or, rather, at least knowledge and maybe sympathy.

47 This view of Hecuba is explicit in Euripides' *Hecuba* in which she is able to dictate the action of the play, and bargain with Agamemnon, in her scheme to revenge herself on Polymnestor, who had murdered the last of her sons, given to him in Thrace for safe-keeping. It is impossible to know the relationship of this play by Euripides with Ennius' *Hecuba*.

48 In Snell, *Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta* (1964, vol. 1). Aelian, *Varia Historia* 11.8, who had to have seen the inscription, gives second place to Euripides and places *Trojan Women* as the third play in his trilogy. The other two plays, *Alexander* (i.e., Paris) and *Palamedes* also drew on themes from the Trojan War.

Scholarly opinion since Gilbert Murray, editor of the Oxford Classical Text to Euripides (1913), has linked the destruction of Melos to Euripides' play. Murray's text was produced during the series of brutal wars and brinksmanship that preceded World War I. So, too, a performance of Seneca's *Troas* during the Bosnian War (1998) had the chorus dressed as women from Kosovo; cf. Raby (2000).

The Roman audience, a mix of men and women,⁴⁹ citizen and foreign resident, and the identification of a Julio-Claudian Roman audience with the suffering of women was not immediate but vicarious. The imperial Roman chorus might possibly have had women,⁵⁰ rather than a chorus of male *ephebes* as at Athens nearly 500 years before Seneca. That one could have recognized individual members of the chorus in fifth century Athens, since some potentially were relatives, affected the reception, and thus also message conveyed, of tragedy, a limitation with which Roman tragedy did not have to cope. For a member of the audience at the premiere of Seneca's *Troas*, the most recent foreign enemy to come within spear's throw of Rome was Hannibal, more than 250 years in the past. If the smoke of Melos was still in the nostrils of Euripides' audience, the Roman atrocity most memorable to its moralists⁵¹ was the sack of Syracuse in 212 BC.

Centering his play around the Trojan women, and giving them the title role would not have struck as deep a chord with Seneca's audience; it would not have been topical. Stroh⁵² has pointed out that the manuscript tradition is split between *TROADES* (E-Group) and *TROAS* (A-Group) and he has argued that *Troas* is the correct title.⁵³ Stroh's observation is almost certainly correct as the city of Troy itself is the major non-speaking role in the play. The single set is easily and reliably inferred from references throughout the text. The right front of the stage must have the tomb of Hector in which Astyanax will be hidden; the front of the stage will be the beach. On one wing, more likely the left, will be a tower from which Astyanax will leap, frustrating sacrifice by suicide. But most important the backdrop and the area in front of it represent smoldering Troy. Several times smoke still rising from its ruins is mentioned.

But Troy is more than just an evocative setting; it is a character in the play. By the fourth line Hecuba has already referred to Troy in the vocative (1–4):

-
- 49 There is even evidence from Juvenal 6.652–654 of a version of the *Alcestis* that was put on specifically for women. The difference between the citizen male only Athenian audience and the much more egalitarian Roman one placed considerable demands on Seneca's genius. Merely transporting a Greek drama would reveal itself to be wooden.
- 50 The evidence for women acting in mime is extremely convincing, and a case for tragedy by analogy has many supporters; cf. Volk (2000) among others.
- 51 The sack of Syracuse in Cicero and other Republican writers was viewed as the point at which luxury came to Rome corrupting its traditional values.
- 52 Cf. Volk (2000) and her bibliography.
- 53 Although plays named for cities are unknown among other Greek and Latin plays that survive, there are many plays names for places in the fragments or where places, such as *Sack of Miletus*, is part of the title. This is particularly true of historical plays from the Roman Republic.

*Quicumque regno fidit et magna potens
dominatur aula nec leves metuit deos
animumque rebus credulum laetis dedit,
me videat et te, Troia . . .*

Whoever trusts in domains and great power,
rules in a palace, does not fear changeable gods
and gives a gullible heart to happiness,
let him see me and you, Troy . . .

Talthybius, the Greek herald, also addresses Troy in the vocative in a speech in which he recounts a vision as justification for demanding Polyxena to be married to Achilles, the Thessalian prince (181–183):

*Emicuit ingens umbra Thessalici ducis,
Threicia qualis arma proludens tuis
iam, Troia, fatis stravit . . .*

The huge ghost of the Thessalian leader shot out,
such as when fighting against Thracian armies,
already he practiced for your demise, Troy . . .

Even at a cursory count, Troy is mentioned more often than any human, living or dead. Seneca draws out how for both Greeks and the Trojan women Troy is both alive—it is often referred to in the present—and a ruin. The language that Greeks and the Trojan women use to describe Astyanax who by metonymy becomes the new Troy is the same. The Trojan women refuse to see Troy as dead as long as Astyanax is alive, a sentiment they recant when Ulysses comes to the same conclusion. They are both right, when Astyanax throws himself off the tower, in a very real sense the last tower of Troy, that is, its *soter* and avenger dies and with him the last breath of Troy.

Act 3 (409–810) is the center of the play in which Ulysses is sent to retrieve Astyanax whom Andromache has hidden in the tomb of Hector. Andromache opens the act by noting that for the Trojan women Troy has fallen only now (*Ilium vobis modo . . . cecidit*, 412–413) but for her it fell a long time ago (*mihi cecidit olim*, 413) when Hector died. Cradling Astyanax, she suddenly intuits what must happen at which point the fall of Troy is still happening (*nondum ruentis Ilii fatum stetit*, 428). The self-serving vision of Talthybius is matched by one of her own. Hector appears to her in a dream and urges her to hide Astyanax: . . . *Troia quod cecidit gemis . . . amove/ quocumque nostrae parvulam*

shaken from his resolve, as his concern is the comfort of Greek women, not Trojan women. Andromache makes a last appeal (739–741):

*has, has ruinas urbis in cinerem datae
hic excitabit? Hae manus Troiam erigent?* 740
nullas habet spes Troia, si tales habet.

Will he levitate these, these ruins of a city
rendered to ash? Will these hands resurrect Troy?
Troy has no hope, if it has such [hope].

The last mention of Troy in the play is by the messenger reporting the death of Astyanax (1128–1131):⁵⁶

*magna pars vulgi levis
odit scelus spectatque; nec Troes minus
suum frequentant funus et pavidum metu* 1130
partem ruentis ultimam Troiae vident.

most of the unwashed [Greek] mob
hate the crime and watch; not any less the Trojans
crowd around their own funeral and trembling with fear
they watch the last act of the fall of Troy.

The chorus ends the play looking at the smoke of Troy still burning. It was its funeral pyre.

Scholars have understood Seneca's *Troas* from Greek sensibilities, and in this they are wrong. *THE* fall of a city in Roman literature, in early imperial fresco of the cities of Vesuvius, in Roman mosaic, in Roman sculpture and in Roman relief is the fall of Troy. It was ubiquitous and omni-present in the ancient Roman imagination. Courtesy of centuries of mythic Roman history, codified by the genius of Vergil, to the Romans, the Trojans were 'us' not 'them'. This is nowhere more apparent than in Cassandra's outburst at the end of Seneca's *Agamemnon* which is worlds apart from that of Aeschylus' play of the same name for the simple reason that they reflect the sensibilities of different worlds (1004–1012):

⁵⁶ In act 4 (861–1008) Helen takes on the role of Ulysses. She has been dispatched to escort Polyxena to her "wedding". References to Troy recede; her image is that of Iphigeneia at Aulis but Polyxena embraces her death as her best possible outcome.

- {Cas.} *ne trahite, vestros ipsa praecedam gradus.
perferre prima nuntium Phrygibus meis* 1005
*propereo: repletum ratibus eversis mare,
captas Mycenae, mille ductorem ducum,
ut paria fata Troicis lueret malis,
perisse dono, feminae stupro, dolo.
nihil moramus, rapite, quin grates ago:* 1010
iam, iam iuvat vixisse post Troiam, iuvat.
- {Clym.} *furiosa, morere.*
{Cas.} *veniet et vobis furor.*

- {Cas.} Don't push; I will walk on my own in front of you.
I am in a rush to bring the first news
to my fellow Trojans: the sea gorged with capsized ships,
Mycenae captured, the king of a thousand kings,
how he met an end equal to the sufferings of Troy,
died from a gift, by a woman's wiles, by a cheap trick.
No need to linger, come on, oh, how I owe you thanks:
how joyful to have out-lived Troy, what a joy.
- {Clym.} Die, mad-woman.
{Cas.} Madness will come for you, too.

Several Roman generals celebrated triumphs for victories over the Greeks starting at the conclusion of the Hannibalic wars and not ending until the death of the last Ptolemaic ruler, Cleopatra, in 30 BC. These lines that celebrate the humiliation of Greece would not have found favor with Aeschylus' audience, but reflect the difficult relationship of Greece, most especially Athens, and Rome.

The Seneca who wrote *Troas* also wrote Nero's maiden speech in the Senate, AD 54,⁵⁷ which proposed tax abatement for Troy into perpetuity, as it was Rome's mother city. Seneca the politician made Seneca the playwright topical. The University of Cincinnati excavations under Brian Rose have produced evidence of a spectacular rise in prosperity at Troy at just this moment. The city spread out on the slopes below Hissalik and has proven at least as extensive

57 It is irresistible to want to see the composition of *Troas* tied to the celebrations surrounding Nero's assumption of the *toga virilis* or the donative that followed Nero's maiden speech in the Senate.

as its more storied predecessor on the site.⁵⁸ Plaques of scenes of the Trojan War are dated to the middle of the first century AD, the fresco of Agamemnon recoiling but watching the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, comparable to Greek riveted revulsion at the death of Polyxena in Seneca's *Troas*, is most probably Neronian as are also the two graffiti at Pompeii of lines from Seneca's *Agamemnon*.⁵⁹ Performance of plays in the Empire is a more difficult subject than it needs to be. No one doubts the fact of gladiatorial combat or horse racing during the Empire; more theatres were constructed during the Empire than amphitheatres and circuses combined. New plays were written and staged and many are known from disparate sources to have been in revival. It would be attractive to put Republican tragedies on Troy (*supra* n. 2) on the Julio-Claudian stage but evidence is lacking. What we do have is a play from the co-regent to Nero, who could have forced his will if he cared to, living in a town where human nature would suggest companies would have been only too happy to stage Seneca's plays in hope of patronage. Troy suits well as a symbol of a consistent Neronian eastern policy of engagement with Armenia, the architects of which policy would have been Seneca and Burrus. Astyanax did prove incapable of levitating Troy from its ashes (*hae manus Troian erigent*, 740); it was left to Nero under Seneca's gaze to accomplish that trick.

4 Fellow Citizenship in Suffering: Octavia and the Hercules Oetaeus

Space will not permit an investigation of the *Hercules Oetaeus*, named for his immolation of Mt. Oeta at the play's end, and *Octavia* in as much detail as one might wish.⁶⁰ This is a pity since these hybrids from the reign of Domitian—they both are indebted in part to Greek plays, to Seneca and to Republican historical drama⁶¹—have much direct applicability to an analysis of Seneca's *Troas*. In particular, both plays have double choruses, the *Octavia* one of middle-aged male supporters of Octavia, Nero's wife, and the other like-minded

58 One need only consult the excavation reports published by Rose or look at the annual journal, *Studia Troica*, devoted just to Troy.

59 Susan Woodford's, *The Trojan War in Art* (1993) remains a sensible place to start. On the graffiti at Pompeii, cf. Kohn in this volume.

60 For the *Hercules Oetaeus*, I am extremely grateful to David Konstan who has shared with me a pre-publication copy of his translation, and has exchanged ideas with me on many occasions. For the *Octavia*, I quote from a version of the play I have produced for the modern stage.

61 For which, cf. Konstan and Ginsberg in this volume.

women of ages similar to Poppaea, Nero's pregnant mistress. The two choruses of the *Hercules Oetaeus* also reflect factions in marital strife: one is comprised of women from Aetolia, who accompanied Deianira, now middle-aged, Hercules' prize from the fight against Achelous, and mother of his now grown son Hyllus; the other chorus is one of young women who were taken along as captives from Oechalia with their princess, Iole, the pregnant mistress of Hercules.⁶² One would expect, and one finds, hostility between the choruses, but remarkably at least the *Hercules Oetaeus*, and possibly the *Octavia*, end with choral reconciliation.

The *Hercules Oetaeus* is the simpler case and will have to stand in for both. The structure is arguably post-Senecan and so the neat division into acts framing choral odes gives way to a doublet in which scenes and themes of the first half of the play find their response in the second half. The young captive women from Oechalia come on stage in the first choral ode (104–172). Predictably they sing about the sack of their city by Hercules, which introduces Iole who sings in much more complex meters about how, like the Trojan women in Seneca, she has been forced to watch the death of her parents and destruction of her city. It is unknown whether the other chorus had already inhabited the stage. At a minimum the attendant of Deianira has overheard and Act 1 (233–582), which owes much to the scene between Phaedra and her attendant in Seneca's *Phaedra*, is an extended discussion in which Deianira weighs her options.⁶³

In the second chorus (583–706), the Aetolian supporters of Deianira start by showing solidarity with Deianira but then lodge a general complaint against greed and the pursuit of riches. Deianira re-appears, the chorus announces her entrance (707–714), and she communicates with the chorus her fear that she might have done something unfortunate. The frantic appearance of Hyllus (742–884) discloses that a garment sent to Hercules had a flesh-eating virus. Hyllus threatens to kill Deianira when he discovers that Deianira sent the garment, at which point he rushes out. This in turns causes a second tête-a-tête

62 The close parallelism is not accidental. On one view (my own, but not universally agreed), both plays belong to the period of Domitian's attempt to divorce his wife, Domitia, the daughter of Corbulo, in favour of marrying his much younger niece, Julia, whom he forced to have an abortion. Public sentiment forced Domitian to abandon his plan (and Domitia lived long enough to conspire in his assassination).

63 The first half of the *Hercules Oetaeus* is dominated by Deianira, the second half by Hercules. Similarly the first half of the *Octavia* is dominated by Octavia and the second half by Poppaea.

(885–982) in which Deianira tries to assess what should be done. At 982 Hyllus rushes back on stage, minded to absolve Deianira. It is difficult to assign the next choral ode (1031–1130). Mythological references, particularly to Orpheus, in the longer section of the ode might point in the direction of the older Aetolian women. The balance of the ode takes up “cosmic dissolution”, a constant theme in both Seneca’s prose and verse works. Act 4 follows (1131–1336) in which Hercules in the normal spoken meter interacts with the chorus continuing the meter it had used in the prior choral ode. Hercules and the chorus speak at cross-purposes: Hercules fastens on his own pain but also on how the world will suffer without him to keep culling the monsters that crop up. The choruses, in spurts of ten lines, more often than not offer comfort with something drawn from mythology. At 1137 Alcmena appears, followed in quick succession by Hyllus (1419). The last two choral odes are interesting because they follow the announcement by Hyllus of the suicide of Deianira (1419–1426) and Hercules’ extortion of a promise from Hyllus that he will marry Iole (1488–1496).

The tone of the choral ode at 1518–1606 is changed. Acrimony is gone and the chorus reflects on how Hercules will descend to the underworld to be judged but then ascend to the heavens. The chorus is assigned given the final words in the play (1983–1996), which recapitulates in short compass the prior ode. It is unknown who sings the final odes but with the death of Deianira, the chorus of Aetolian women has lost their *patrona*. In the death of Deianira they have lost their “city”, in that they have lost the person who was the focus and anchor of their world. Circumstances have brought them to a community of suffering with the other chorus. Lamentation in antiquity was assigned mainly to women and this link is one that transcends their differences. By right, women who will mourn the passing of Hercules should sing the last odes, and that should unify the two choruses into one.

One places confidence in “choral reconciliation” in Roman tragedy because the community of suffering is a feature of several Roman imperial tragedies, and is perhaps the strongest bond among women. The pro-Jason/Glaue chorus of Seneca’s *Medea*, for example, has sympathy for Medea, but her double strangeness in being both a foreigner and a witch place her beyond the realm of curiosity and into the dark box of things that must be feared. Even so, they empathize with her in ways in which Creon and Jason have no capacity. The chorus of Athenian women in Seneca’s *Phaedra* is not pro-Phaedra but neither are they pro-Hippolytus. Even if he is a fellow Athenian, and presumptively regent in Theseus’ absence, his personality quirks are beyond their understanding and sympathy. Phaedra is familiar to the chorus as she is sister to Ariadne, Theseus’ first entanglement and is, like them, an aristocratic woman, even if her family’s sexual history gives pause.

The two choruses of the *Octavia*, one of male supporters of Octavia and the other of female supporters of Poppaea, remain antagonistic, even though in the concluding lines of the play, spoken by the pro-Poppaea chorus, according to Davis,⁶⁴ one can see some glimmer that Octavia's exile and certain death diminishes them also. In the victory of Poppaea, her chorus of adherents comes to realise the larger implications of the too easy replacement of Octavia and so gravitates towards the pro-Octavia chorus. It is possible, following precedents in Aristophanic comedy, such as the *Lysistrata*, and even in some of the tragedies of Aeschylus, that the two choruses unite to speak the final lines of the play as they exit. The distance that needed to be bridged is shown in two odes on the power of love in the *Octavia*: while the chorus of middle-aged men carp at the humiliations of love, how it forced even Jupiter to adopt a series of disguises to pursue his pleasure, the chorus of young women, very much as if at a bachelorette party, celebrate the rankness of the power of love and consider which animal form of Jupiter would be the most sexually exciting. Even so, by play's end, Octavia stepping on a boat, sailing to her certain death, embraced in its finality the later cruel death also of Poppaea, a fact which the audience would have known and which the chorus can feel coldly as a premonition.

5 Hecuba's Prologue and Performance

Hecuba starts with three throwaway lines stated in the indicative as fact,⁶⁵ to focus the attention of members of the audience who might be adjusting themselves in their seats or chatting (1–3):

*Quicumque regno fidit et magna potens
dominatur aula nec leves metuit deos
animumque rebus credulum laetis dedit . . .*

Whoever trusts in domains and great power,
rules in a palace, does not fear changeable gods
and gives a gullible heart to happiness . . .

64 Cf. especially, but not only, Davis (1993) appendix 1 (262–263).

65 If meant to be gnomic, the present subjunctive should have been used, although Seneca also uses the perfect as the Latin equivalent of the Greek gnomic aorist. For these lines, cf. also *supra*.

It is only when she is sure that she has our attention that Hecuba turns her back on the audience,⁶⁶ and in the subjunctive, an implied future-more-vivid condition, introduces Troy as a character in the play that has been murdered as surely as Priam (4):

me videat et te, Troia . . .

let him see me, and you, Troy.

In less than four lines, Hecuba, the ranking and eldest woman in the play, has equated herself with her broken city. She continues (4–6):

*non umquam tulit
documenta fors maiora, quam fragili loco
starent superbi.*

Never has fortune produced
greater evidence on how frail a foundation
they mighty stand.

Although it would be possible to convey the cataclysm in words alone in a garden or *cenaculum*, there can be no substitute to visual impact of actual performance of these lines. *nunquam* for *non umquam* splayed on lifeless parchment is indifferent, but the sob-choked long syllables *non um quam* want an actor, or actress, standing on stage. *loco* can again direct the viewer's gaze to the broken foundation of the palace.

This seems implicit in *columen* (columns) that could physically have been the tumbled columns on stage and metaphorically represent “pillar” as English uses “a pillar of strength” (6–7):

*columen eversum occidit
pollentis Asiae, caelitem egregious labor*

ripped up, the pillar of powerful
Asia fell, the astonishing work of the gods⁶⁷

66 Acoustics of the *proscenium* would have made speech directed at the stage set as audible as lines delivered looking at the audience.

67 I take the last phrase as purposely ambiguous: the walls of Troy were built by the gods but equally Venus gives Aeneas special vision so that he can see the gods participating in the destruction of Troy. Tumbled columns are also important in the *Octavia*.

But in imperial Roman stagecraft it more likely refers to the colonnaded three story façade of the theater as well as the portico that surrounded the top of the back of the seats. By the reference to columns, Seneca brilliantly gave something for Hecuba to point at that is impressive visually but lost in reading, and by a gesture that would have swept from the backdrop of the stage to the colonnade behind the seats would have invited the audience in their suspension of disbelief to include themselves among the survivors of the fall of Troy.⁶⁸ Plausibility gains probability when one compares the late Republican (58 BC) theatre of Scaurus that featured 360 columns of Hymettan marble on his non-permanent stage and 3000 bronze statues between the columns.⁶⁹ *septena Tanain ora* (9), *tepidum rudenti Tigrin* (11), and *vicina prospiciens Scythas* (12) name dead allies of Troy, respectively Rhesus, Memnon, and Penthesilea, who would have been known to the Roman audience from plays and from art, that is, from spectacle that was present before their eyes, and tactile. A simple gesture could have momentarily transformed the imperial portraits and other statues that populated the Roman stage, even the lounging satyrs often placed at the front of the stage to hide the curtain (*aulaeum*), into famous allies who died for Troy.⁷⁰

Hecuba sighs at line 15 (*en*) and immediately returns to precise, descriptive details: *alta muri decora...congestis/tectis...regiam...domus* (15–17). Comparable descriptions are in Euripides, for whom performance is not doubted, but more important here one can *see* the city moving in concentrically from the walls to the rooftops to the palace. The noose has been tightening as her gaze zooms in; one *feels* with her when the palace is identified as her home; one would guess that Hecuba pointed at the *scaena frons*, the wings, and

68 Or perhaps the assembled Greek army. Such a use of the architectural frame of the Roman theatre as a prop is hardly contestable. One need only consult Beacham (2013) on how Roman aristocrats “orchestrated” (his term) the public rooms of their homes to greatest advantage in the morning audience, itself a form of cheap theatre.

69 At a minimum, Hecuba could point at a column on the *proscenium*; *eversum* would direct the audience to topple it in their minds. Broken columns and torn down statues of Poppaea are referenced also in the *Octavia* in the after-math of the pro-Octavia riot of her chorus. For the theatre of Scaurus, cf. Erasmo (2004: 84–87).

70 The Roman curtain was lowered, not raised, a practice that continued into the Renaissance. For statuary on the Roman stage, see epilogue to this volume; for statuary and columns on the Victorian and Edwardian stage, cf. Macintosh (2013) and Slaney in this volume.

perhaps even the box in which the presiding magistrate sat.⁷¹ There is motion behind Hecuba; in her desolation, she misses the fact that the chorus is being herded to her⁷² or, more likely, non-speaking extras representing Greeks are removing objects from the stage. An action is implied in lines 18–19:

*Non prohibet avidas flamma victoris manus:
diripitur ardens Troia . . .*

Flames do not put off the greedy hands of the victors;
Troy, burning, is stolen away . . .

Our gaze is not allowed to wander from the sight of the fallen city: line 21 mentions the ashes of Troy (*favilla . . . Iliaca*). Line 22 wants again someone on stage at whom Hecuba points, a person who is using his eyes to look around the stage, an action that involves us equally as viewers/fellow captive Trojans (22–23):

*stat avidus irae victor et lentum Ilium
metitur oculis . . .*

A “victor”, greed fueled by anger, stands still
and measures gentle Troy . . .

The first part of the prologue concludes with the observation that 1000 ships would not be enough to remove all the booty.

The balance of the prologue (28–66) shifts to Hecuba claiming for herself primacy in suffering. What has been, in other applications, glibly termed “martyr points” drives most of the interactions among the female characters for much of the play. Hecuba, the chorus, Andromache, and even Helen each stake a claim for how each has suffered more than the others. What the prologue and

71 The *pulpitum*, that is, the wall at the front of the stage separating it from the orchestra cannot be indicated. This “fourth wall”, the one that separates the audience from the actors, is not a feature of imperial Roman drama in which the chorus normally acted on stage and for which there is evidence of choral entrances and exits through the aisles of the *cavea*.

72 For Attic tragedy and most of Roman tragedy, it is assumed that the chorus sings its first ode as it enters the orchestra (Greek) or goes on stage (Roman). There are instances, such as Seneca’s *Hercules Furens* and possibly the *Octavia* where the chorus has knowledge of what has been said before and so must have gone on stage before it started singing.

opening choral ode make clear is that the fall of a city is visual and visceral and to have its full impact needs the engagement of multiple senses. Troy fallen on a page cannot have the sounds, the smells, the sights, that is, the spectacle that only full production can offer. I need to hear Hecuba weep, but I also need to feel I can almost taste the ashes in her tears.⁷³

73 This contribution is dedicated to the memory of Malle Jurima Romet, who was part of a book club which did a parlour reading of a play by Norm Foster that had recently been put on by the Hudson (Québec) Players under the direction of Heather Markgraff. Seneca's plays could, and certainly, did receive readings, but such is equally true of his Attic counterparts, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. More ancients would have known Euripides' *Trojan Women* through reading; this does not mean his *Trojan Women* was not produced. The success of the production fostered interest in reading (cf. Kohn in this volume); Plutarch's quotations indicate consultation of texts not memories of performance. *Recitatio* and performance are not mutually exclusive; they imply one another. Reading keeps the text "alive" for re-performance.

I should wish to thank Gesine Manuwald, Dorota Dutsch, Ann Suter, and Mary Bachvarova who have read several versions of this contribution, and Allison Keith and Christopher Star who have advised me on several individual points. Mario Erasmo has been most helpful, and patient, in making suggestions in the first section. And, as always, Jane Francis.

Seneca's *Thyestes* and the Political Tradition in Roman Tragedy

P.J. Davis

In this chapter I propose to consider two long-held commonplaces of the criticism of Senecan tragedy, first, that the plays fail to engage with those of Seneca's Republican predecessors¹ and, second, that they offer no critique of the politics of Julio-Claudian Rome.² I shall argue that *Thyestes* in particular constitutes a powerful critique of tyrannical rule and that it is precisely this concern with politics which links Seneca with tragedians like Ennius, Pacuvius and Accius.

Let's begin with the Republicans. Although the tragedies of the Republican period present exclusively Greek material, native subject matter being the preserve of a new genre, the *fabula praetexta*, there is no doubting Roman tragedy's focus on contemporary issues and concerns: Ennius, Pacuvius and Accius aimed at more than producing translations of fifth-century tragedies.

Even the earliest Roman tragedians, Livius Andronicus and Naevius, the authors whose fragments are the most meager, the poets whom we might expect *a priori* to be the most heavily dependent on Greek models, adapt their stories for Roman audiences, with Livius seeming to prefer stories drawn from the Trojan war and its aftermath³ and featuring such specifically Roman values as *maiestas* and *virtus*,⁴ and Naevius, author of an epic on Rome's first war with Carthage and inventor of the *praetexta*, also favoring stories drawn from Trojan

1 E.g. Calder (1983: 185): "On Roman Republican sources Wilamowitz ruled once and for all in 1889. [...] Nero's court did not return to the Republic for inspiration. Not a verse of Senecan tragedy reworks a Republican line in the way that Lucretius and Vergil repeatedly do". For criticism of German statements of this position, cf. Blänsdorf (2008).

2 E.g. Ferri (2003: 70): "Some modern critics have read the tragedies of the Senecan corpus as anti-tyrannical statements in disguise. This hypothesis is probably too extreme, but *Octavia* may be the earliest witness in the history of political and libertarian interpretations of Senecan tragedy". Also, Schiesaro (2003: 6): "Thus we would probably do well ... to dispense with a political reading [of *Thyestes*]".

3 Manuwald (2011: 191). Of the eight certain titles six concern Trojan legend: *Achilles*, *Aegisthus*, *Ajax Mastigophorus*, *Equos Troianus*, *Hermiona*, *Teucer*.

4 Warmington (1957: 12, 16). I cite the line numbers given in Warmington's *Remains of Old Latin* (1956, 1957). Where pertinent, I give cross-references to other editions.

legend,⁵ and showing concern, in *Lycurgus* for example, with such contemporary issues as the importation of eastern cults.⁶

It is in the major tragedians, however, that we find the clearest evidence of what we can call the Romanization of Greek myth. We find, for example, the use of Roman constitutional language. Thus in Ennius' *Achilles* we find senior Greek princes at Troy referred to as *hic ordo* ("this order"), an expression regularly used to designate members of the Roman senate,⁷ while Achilles is urged to protect the citizens (*serva ciues*), a Republican turn of phrase unimaginable in Homer.⁸ We find characters in the works of all three tragedians speaking of *imperium*, a term which, as Jocelyn notes, "belonged properly to the official language" and "had a semi-religious tone lacking in Greek words for power and authority."⁹ In *Hector's Ransom* (*Hectoris Lytra*), the Ennian Priam urges the Myrmidon guards to show mercy in accordance with their *imperium*,¹⁰ while in Pacuvius' *Judgment of Arms* (*Armorum Iudicium*) a character insists that action must be taken in accordance with *imperium* (*pro imperio agendum est*),¹¹ and in Accius' *Thyestes*, Thyestes wonders whether, after devouring his sons, he will ever be able to attain *imperium* in Argos (*Argivum imperium*).¹²

We also find that Greek myths are rewritten to reflect Roman social structures. Consider, for example, Ennius' rewriting of these lines from Euripides:

τὸ δ' ἄξιωμα, καὶν κακῶς λέγῃς, τὸ σὸν
 πείσει· λόγος γὰρ ἔκ τ' ἀδοξούντων ἰὼν
 καὶ τῶν δοκούντων αὐτὸς οὐ ταῦτόν σθένει.

(EURIPIDES *HECUBA* 293–295)

In his Loeb edition Kovacs translates these lines with literal accuracy:

What is more, even if you speak without eloquence, your prestige will carry the day. For the same speech has quite a different force if it is spoken by a man of repute or a nobody.

5 Four of the six recorded tragedies of Naevius are linked to Troy: *Equos Troianus*, *Hector Proficiscens*, *Hesiona*, *Iphigenia*.

6 Cf. Flower (2000: 27–29); Boyle (2006: 47–48).

7 5 W; 5 Joc. For the significance of *hic ordo*, cf. Jocelyn 171–72.

8 6 W; 7 Joc. For the significance of *cives*, cf. Jocelyn 173.

9 Jocelyn (1967: 298).

10 198 W; 75 Joc.

11 46 W; 36 Schierl.

12 194 W.

Ennius rewrites these lines in his *Hecuba* as follows:

*haec tu etsi perverse dices, facile Achivos flexeris:
nam cum opulenti locuntur pariter atque ignobiles,
eadem dicta eademque oratio aequa non aequa valet.*

(206–208 W; 84 JOC.)

Even if you speak wrongly, you will easily persuade the Achaeans:
for when the influential and the unimportant speak side by side,
the same words and the same speech, though equal, are not equally
strong.¹³

The differences between Euripides' original and Ennius' 'translation' are striking, as Aulus Gellius, the source of the Ennian fragment, observed (11.4.1). *Opulenti* (influential) and *ignobiles* (unimportant) do not have the same force as δοκούντων (men of repute) and ἀδοξούντων (nobodies). For Euripides the key issue is reputation, because Hecuba is concerned to persuade Odysseus that it is 'prestige' (τὸ δ' ἀξίωμα) that counts. For Ennius, by contrast, the key issue is social status: his Ulysses will persuade because of his superior social standing.

Note, too, that Ennius translates κακῶς (literally "badly") in an unexpected way. Kovacs, understanding that the Euripidean Hecuba is claiming that reputation is more persuasive than rhetorical skill, rightly translates κακῶς as "without eloquence." Ennius, on the other hand, plays up the moral sense of κακῶς, by rendering the word as *perverse* (wrongly), even if Ulysses speaks falsehoods, his superior status will ensure victory. Note, too, that the cognate adjective *perversus* is even more morally laden than the adverb, for it means not only "wrong-headed" and "misguided", but also "depraved" and "perverted". Also worth noting is the verbal play in the final line of the fragment, *aequa non aequa* (equal, not equally). In Euripides the lines quoted above are preceded by two lines (*Hecuba* 291–292) in which Hecuba asserts that among the Greeks an equal law (νόμος . . . ἴσος, 291) applies to both slaves and free. While the Euripidean Hecuba implicitly commends Greek egalitarianism and uses it to support her case, her Ennian counterpart recognizes the importance of rank and uses it to flatter her addressee: it is not strength of argument that counts, but social class. It seems a reasonable inference that Ennius has taken a play written for an audience that professed democratic values and has rewritten it for an aristocratic society which prized hierarchy above all else.

13 Unless otherwise stated, all translations are my own.

Equally important, and not without implications for politics,¹⁴ is Pacuvius' importation of Roman religious concepts and customs into Greek myth. Most notable in this regard is *Chryses*, a play involving Orestes, Pylades and Iphigenia after their escape from Tauris and which seems to re-enact the events of Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris* on the island of Sminthe. Into this play of recognition and reversal (young Chryses, son of the *Iliad*'s Chryseis, turns out to be a son of Agamemnon and so half-brother to Orestes and Iphigenia) Pacuvius inserts specifically Roman language (most notably the verb *redamptuare* ["to dance in response to the steps of a leader"], a term associated with the Salian priesthood).¹⁵ He also includes a philosophical debate concerning a number of Roman mantic practices:

*cives, antiqui amici maiorum meum,
consilium socii, augurium atque extum interpretes,
postquam prodigium horrifera, portentum pavos . . .*

(101–103 W; 76 SCHIERL)

Citizens, aged friends of my ancestors,
partners in counsel, interpreters of auguries and entrails,
after the terror of the dreadful prodigies, of the portents . . .

As Slater and Schierl point out,¹⁶ reference to "interpreters of auguries and entrails" seems to allude to the Roman priesthoods of the *augures* and *haruspices*, the augurs constituting a distinct and important priestly college and the examination of entrails being a specifically Roman practice. We find similar reference to Roman institutions when a skeptical speaker, labeled by Cicero, our source for this quotation, as a 'natural philosopher,'¹⁷ rejects prophecy:

*nam isti qui linguam avium intellegunt
plusque ex alieno iecore sapiunt quam ex suo,
magis audiendum quam auscultandum censeo.*

(104–106 W; 77 SCHIERL)

14 For the connection between the sacred and the political in Rome, cf. Beard, North and Price (1998: 23).

15 Warmington (1957: 96) = Schierl (2006) fr. 72 For the word's meaning, cf. *OLD* s.v. *redamptuo*.

16 Slater (2000: 318); Schierl (2006: 227).

17 Cic. *Div.* 1.131.9.

For those who understand the language of birds
and are wise more from another's liver than their own,
I think we should hear more than obey.

Here the speaker refers to the same two divinatory practices, for the augurs were responsible for interpreting the flight and cries of birds,¹⁸ while observation of the liver fell within the province of the *haruspices*. While we cannot be certain how these issues were handled in Pacuvius' play, we can be sure that Roman religious practices were thematically important in *Chryses*.¹⁹

I would like to turn now to Accius' *Atræus*. For writers of the imperial period the myth of Atræus and Thyestes was the political myth par excellence. For the Secundus of Tacitus' *Dialogus* (3.3), the story of Thyestes ranks with that of Cato for explosive power, while for Seneca Accius' treatment of the myth bears the stamp of the political environment in which it was written (*De ira* 1.20.4). Whether Aulus Gellius (13.2.2) is correct in assigning the play to the 130s BC (i.e. around the time of the tribunate of Tiberius Gracchus) or whether Seneca (*De ira* 1.20.4) is right in assigning the play to the early 80s BC (the time of Sulla's dictatorship: *Sullano scias saeculo scriptam*), the fact remains that Seneca read Accius' play as a reflection of contemporary politics.

That *Atræus* was indeed political is suggested by the fact that its central character utters one of the most memorable lines in Latin literature, an unabashed assertion of tyrannical power: "*oderint dum metuant*" ("Let them hate, as long as they fear"). These words are cited by Cicero in *Pro Plancio* as an example of the kind of sentiment that evil citizens might welcome ("*quod exciperent improbi cives*", 102.11) and in *Philippics* as part of a reminder to Antony of the fate that tyrants can expect (1.34.2). Seneca, too, links these words with tyranny: in *De clementia*, when distinguishing between kingship and tyranny (1.12.4) and also when urging the young Nero to resort to execution only with reluctance (2.2.2). But the crowning example comes from an actual tyrant, for Suetonius tells us that Caligula was fond of repeating Atræus' famous line (*Caligula* 30.1). But determining precisely how *Atræus* related to contemporary politics

18 E.g. Virg. *Aen.* 3.360–1. Cf. Servius' comment on this passage: *aves autem aut oscines sunt, aut praepetes: oscines quae ore futura praedicunt, praepetes quae volatu augurium significant* ("however birds are either song-birds or flyers: songbirds which predict the future by their utterance, flyers indicate augury by their flight").

19 For recent discussion of these issues, cf. Fantham (2003), Manuwald (2003: 90–92, 99–103), Slater (2000).

is difficult, even if we accept the general consensus that the play was written in the 130s rather than the early 80s.²⁰

But there are other major obstacles to understanding the play's politics. First, there is the difficulty of reconstructing its action. Editions vary in their placing of the various fragments according to the editors' interpretation of the play as a whole. I propose to cite Warmington, giving cross-references to Ribbeck's third edition.²¹ Second, despite the fact that, thanks to Cicero, we have more substantial fragments of *Atrous* than of most Republican tragedies, there is considerable disagreement about the ending. Third, using Seneca's *Thyestes* to reconstruct *Atrous* is likely to lead to question-begging arguments when one of our aims is to explore the extent to which Seneca has exploited Accius' play.

It is possible to arrange the surviving fragments into seven groups. The first, consisting of a report from Servius (R³ 1; 381 W) that the play contained a detailed genealogy of the house of Atrous and a reference to Pelops' winning of Hippodamia (2 R³; 162 W) seems, because of its focus on background, to come from the play's first Act. The second group (3–8 R³; 163–77 W) contains lines from a speech (or speeches) of Atrous in which he prepares himself for revenge by listing Thyestes' crimes (his return from exile, his adultery, his pollution of Atrous' bloodline and his theft of the golden lamb) and asserts one of tyranny's fundamental rules (*oderint dum metuant*). The resemblances between these fragments and Act 2 of *Thyestes* have led scholars to argue that this Accian scene provides the model for the debate between the Senecan Atrous and his minister.²² Then follows a third group of two moralizing fragments (9–9a R³; 178–80 W) usually attributed to Thyestes and a fourth, consisting of a single fragment in which the command is given that no one may eat with the "tyrant", presumably Thyestes, since he is the play's principle or only eater. There follow in Warmington three lines from a choral ode (the fifth group) concerning strange phenomena in the sky (13 R³; 183–185 W) and a sixth group which clearly comes from a messenger's speech describing Atrous'

20 For discussion of the political reception of Roman tragedy in the late Republic, cf. Gruen (1992: 184–85). While Gruen emphasises the lack of evidence for the theatre as a "setting for political demonstrations" (184) in the middle Republic, I argue, to use Aristotelian language, that the actuality of the plays' reception as political constitutes evidence for their political potential.

21 I do not use the most recent edition, Dangel (1995), because I do not accept her placing of some fragments.

22 E.g., Ribbeck (1875: 449–50); Lana (1958–1959, esp. 316–318); Monteleone (1989).

murder of the children (11–12 R³; 186–189 W).²³ Then follows a seventh group (14–19 R³; 190–198 W, with slightly different ordering) presenting the confrontation between Atreus and Thyestes and a final fragment (20 R³; 199–200 W) which Warmington regards as “unplaced”, but which Ribbeck elsewhere interprets as an insult hurled by Thyestes at his brother.²⁴

Even if we leave aside the play's most famous words, there are clear signs of the play's political engagement. We should note, for example, the ways in which Accius emphasizes the work's Roman relevance. Consider Servius' comment on *Aeneid* 8.130:

Steropes et Atlantis filios Oenomaum et Maiam fuisse, Oenomai Hippodamiam filiam, unde Atreus natus; at Maiae filius Mercurius, ex quo Arcades, de quibus Evander: quod Accius in Atreo plenius refert.

(1 R³; 280 W)

That the children of Sterope and Atlas were Oenomaus and Maia, that Hippodamia was daughter of Oenomaus, whence Atreus was born; but Mercury was the son of Maia, from whom the Arcadians, from whom Evander: which Accius reports in fuller detail in *Atreus*.

Dangel notes²⁵ that Accius here employs a heterodox version of Atreus' ancestry in which Atlas, ancestor of the Arcadians, takes the place of Ares and so the tragedian is able to link Atreus with Evander, proto-founder of the city. The effect of this, as Boyle points out, is to link “the saga of Atreus to Rome.”²⁶ Note, too, that either Atreus or Thyestes²⁷ warns of plots laid “for good men” (*bonis*, 9 R³; 178 W), *boni* being a preferred self-description of the *optimates*,²⁸ and that, after consuming his sons, he questions whether he will ever be able to “achieve *imperium* over the Argives”

23 Note that Ribbeck reverses the order of these two groups.

24 Ribbeck (1875: 451) places the fragment earlier in the play. This suggestion is adopted by Dangel (1995: 278).

25 Dangel (1995: 276–77).

26 Boyle (2006: 127).

27 Editors (including Dangel [1995: 280]) favour Thyestes as the speaker of this line. But in support of Atreus, cf. La Penna (1972: 361–62), Messina (1988: 55–57) and Petrone (2002: 247–48).

28 Biliński (1957: 36); Argenio (1961: 210–11); Boyle (2006: 130).

(Warmington 194; Ribbeck xvii).²⁹ It is clear, even from the play's wreckage, that Accius' true subject is Rome, not mythical Argos.

I would like to turn now to the relationship between the second group of fragments of Accius' *Atreus* (Warmington 163–177; Ribbeck iii–viii) and the second act of Seneca's *Thyestes*. Cicero, our source for most of the lines that constitute the second group, tells us that *Atreus* contained a scene in which *Atreus* plotted against his brother: "Doesn't he, when devising the deadly feast for his brother, turn the scheme this way and that in his thought" (*ille finestas epulas fratri comparans nonne uersat huc et illuc cogitatione rationem, De natura deorum* 3.68.2). Given that Act 2 of Seneca's *Thyestes* presents such plotting, it is not unreasonable to argue that the Senecan scene resembled that of Accius. On the other hand, the fact that the interplay of similarity and difference is fundamental to the concept of intertextuality makes it difficult to reconstruct Accius' scene on the basis of a later text. We cannot, for example, assume that the Accian *Atreus* is addressing a minister: it is possible that he occupies the stage alone.³⁰

Another point of controversy concerns whether the Accian *Thyestes* returns to Argos of his own accord or at *Atreus*' invitation. Here is the key passage:

*iterum Thyestes Atreum adtrectatum aduenit,
iterum iam adgreditur me et quietum suscitāt:
maior mihi moles, maius miscendumst malum,
qui illius acerbum cor contundam et comprimam.*

(WARMINGTON 163–166 = RIBBECK III)

Again *Thyestes* has come to lay hands on *Atreus*,
again he approaches/attacks me and rouses me from peace.
I need greater effort, greater evil must be stirred,
to subdue and crush his bitter heart.

In his reconstruction of the play Lana claimed that Accius had adopted the version of the myth that we find in Seneca, *viz.* that *Thyestes* returns at his

29 For discussion of Accius' use of political language in other plays, cf. Biliński (1957: 29–36). Note, however, that the lines which Biliński quotes lack context and so it is difficult to be confident about his overall conclusions.

30 For this cf. Aricò (2005: 21).

brother's suggestion.³¹ La Penna argued,³² however, that these words imply that Thyestes has come on his own initiative. It must be acknowledged that these lines, taken at face value, support La Penna's case, for a rational Atreus could hardly accuse Thyestes of planning an assault if he is merely responding to his brother's invitation. It is not, however, clear that Atreus is rational. Certainly his language suggests that he is in the grip of powerful emotions. Note the repetition of *iterum* (again) at the beginning of the first two lines of the fragment, the play on 't' and 'r' sounds in the first line, and the vigorous alliteration of 'm' in the third line and of 'c' in the fourth. It is not surprising that Cicero describes these lines as "tense, energetic, threatening" (*contentum, vehemens, imminens, de Oratore* 3.219). Moreover, these lines are not necessarily inconsistent with the situation in the second act of Seneca's *Thyestes*, where Atreus considers that acceptance of his invitation to return will be a sign that Thyestes lusts for power (*Thyestes* 288–289). In a similar fashion, the Republican Atreus might well have viewed acceptance of an invitation as tantamount to an assault. In my view, we do not have sufficient evidence to determine whether the Accian Thyestes returns at his brother's request or not.

On the other hand, we do know that the Republican Atreus was no less obsessed than his Senecan counterpart with his wife's adultery and with Thyestes' theft of power. Atreus speaks in the strongest possible language of Thyestes' seduction of Aerope: "*qui non sat habuit coniugem inlexe in stuprum*" ("he was not satisfied with enticing my wife into debauchery"; Warmington 169; Ribbeck 205) and is troubled by the possibility that his sons may not be his:

*quod re in summa summum esse arbitror
periculum, matres conquinari regias,
contaminari stirpem ac misceri genus.*

(WARMINGTON 170–172 = RIBBECK VII)

This I think in a crisis is the critical
danger, that royal women are defiled,
their offspring polluted and their birth confused.

31 Lana (1958–59: 299). This position has few supporters, e.g. Baldarelli (2004: 209–210); Benedetto Zimbone (1973: 268).

32 La Penna (1972: 359). Ribbeck (1875: 448–9) had argued for this position, citing Aesch. *Ag.* 1589 as precedent. Most scholars support this position, e.g. Aricò (2005: 21–22); Dangel (1995: 277); Fantham (2005: 66); Messina (1988: 60–61); Monteleone (1989: 108); Petrone (2002: 251).

The Senecan Atreus puts it more succinctly: *corrupta coniunx, imperi quassa est fides, / domus aegra, dubius sanguis* (wife corrupted, confidence in power was shaken, house sick, blood unsure, 239–240; see also *Thyestes* 327–330, 1098–1102). Moreover, both kings recall Thyestes' treachery in detail. Here is the Accian Atreus:

*adde huc quod mihi portento caelestum pater
prodigium misit, regni stabilimen mei,
agnum inter pecudes aurea clarum coma,
quem clam Thyestem clepere ausum esse e regia;
qua in re adiutricem coniugem cepit sibi.*

(8 R³; 173–177 W)

Add to this the fact that the gods' father miraculously sent me a prodigy, support for my kingship, a lamb bright among flocks for its golden fleece, which Thyestes dared to steal from the palace secretly; in this matter he took my wife as his accomplice.

The Senecan Atreus, having described the significance of the "mysterious ram" at some length (225–233), makes the same accusation:

*hunc facinus ingens ausus assumpta in scelus
consorte nostri perfidus thalami auehit.*

(*THYESTES* 234–235)

Daring a massive outrage, enlisting in his crime the partner of my bed, the traitor carries it off.

In both plays the motivation of Atreus is identical: the desire for revenge on a brother who has stolen both wife and kingdom and called into question his sons' legitimacy.

There are other similarities. Both scenes present an Atreus who self-consciously stirs himself to greater action. Atreus' opening lines in Act 2 of *Thyestes* (176–191) can be viewed as an elaboration of the Accian Atreus' call for "greater effort," "greater evil" (3.200 R³; 165 W). And both present an Atreus who is a shameless advocate of tyranny (*oderint dum metuant*; 5 R³; 168 W; cf. *Thyestes* 204–218).

Even if we leave aside the similarities of plot between the two plays (the cooking of the children [12 R³; 187–189 W], strange astronomical phenomena

[13 R³; 183–185 W], the solitary banquet [10 R³; 181–182 W], Atreus' taunts [14 R³; 190 W], Thyestes' moralizing [15 R³; 192 W]), there are broader thematic connections. I have already noted that in both plays Atreus is concerned with the paternity of his sons. In fact, both plays reveal a more general concern with heredity. This is, of course, most apparent in *Thyestes*, where Tantalus, ancestor of both Atreus and Thyestes, appears on stage in the first act, where Atreus uses his ancestors as spurs to action (242–243), where the killing and cooking of the children takes place in a site adorned with ancestral trophies (657–664), where children's blood is served in an heirloom cup (982–983) and where crime's greatest glory is undoing Aerope's adultery and vindicating the birth of Agamemnon and Menelaus (1098–1099).³³ If we turn to Accius, the evidence from Servius³⁴ suggests that *Atreus* began with a detailed genealogy of the house of Tantalus and Pelops. The play, moreover, contains reflections on heredity:

*probae etsi in segetem sunt deteriores datae
fruges, tamen ipsae suapte natura enitent.*

(20 R³; 199–200 W)

Good grain, even though it is given into inferior land,
nevertheless shines out through its own nature.

This passage presents significant problems. Warmington (199–200) assigns no speaker and labels this fragment “unplaced”, while Ribbeck attributes the lines to Atreus, linking them to r. 7 (170–172 W), (Warmington 170–172),³⁵ and Dangel attributes them to Thyestes.³⁶ Wherever they come from and whoever the speaker is, these lines confirm that heredity was an important issue in the play for, while they doubtless arise as comment on a particular situation, perhaps concern over the legitimacy of Atreus' children, they constitute generalized philosophical reflection on the nature of reproduction.

Also important in both plays is the nature of power. That power is critical in *Thyestes* is clear. The central act, Act 3, flanked on either side by choral meditations on the nature of power, has as its climax a coronation in which Thyestes accepts his share of kingship (541–542). Note, too, that *imperium*, that key term for Roman power, occurs four times in the play, twice in Act 2 when Atreus

33 For further discussion of heredity in *Thyestes*, cf. Davis (2003: 57–59).

34 Quoted above p. 157.

35 Ribbeck (1875: 451).

36 Dangel (1995: 278–79).

reflects on his loss of power (223, 239) and twice in Act 3 when young Tantalus and Atreus try to persuade Thyestes to accept his brother's offer (471, 526). Perhaps even more telling is the sole occurrence of *imperium* in the remnants of the Accian version, in lines attributed to Thyestes:

*egone Argivum imperium attingam aut Pelopia digner domo?
quo me ostendam? quod templum adeam? quem ore funesto alloquar?*

(17 R³; 194–195 W)

Am I to attain power over the Argives or be worthy of the house of Pelops?
Where am I to show myself? What temple am I to approach? Whom am I
to address with my murderous/polluted mouth?

We have a number of fragments detailing Thyestes' response to Atreus' revelation that Thyestes' has just eaten his own sons. We have his complaint that his brother urged him to devour his children (16 R³; 196–197 W) and his accusation that Atreus has broken faith (15 R³; 192–193 W). But in this passage Thyestes reflects on the consequences of his actions. That he should wonder how he might appear in public or approach sacred ground or use his mouth in speech, that mouth both murderous and polluted, is not surprising. But that Thyestes' first consideration should be the possibility that devouring his children may prove an obstacle to achieving power is truly shocking. This man is indeed worthy of the house of Pelops.

There is a further connection between Accius' *Atreus* and Seneca's *Thyestes*. For a reader or spectator familiar with the remnants of Republican tragedy, one of the most striking aspects of this imperial play is its multiplication of devices to underline the Roman relevance of Greek myth. Like other Senecan plays, most notably *Medea*, *Thyestes* shows awareness of a much wider world than any classical Greek play. In *Thyestes* we find reference to the river Tagus in the west (354), to Libya in the south (356), to eastern peoples like the Parthians (384, 462, 603) and Sarmatians (375), to places like India (602, 707) and China, though perhaps with a nod to the impossibility of a chorus of Argive elders actually being familiar with so remote a place: (*et (quocumque loco iacent)/Seres, vellere nobiles*, (and the fleece-famed Chinese [wherever they are], 378). 378–379).³⁷ We find peculiarly Italian references (an Umbrian hound, 498, the sea off Bruttium, 578) and specifically Roman concepts like *pietas* and *imperium*. We find Thyestes troubled by rooftop gardens (464–465) and Atreus occupying

37 Cf. Herington (1966: 437–38); Tarrant (1985: 143).

a palace with golden beams and marble columns (646–647), contemporary practices censured by the moralizing Seneca (*Epistulae morales* 90.25, 122.8). Note that Atreus' sacrifice involves the Roman practice of *extispicium*, in this case the ritual examination of the children's entrails (757–758), and that the play refers to Roman household gods, Lares and Penates (24, 52, 264, 775). But, above all, we find the play's Argive nobles choosing a life unknown to Roman citizens (*nullis nota Quiritibus / aetas*, 396–397). Like Accius and his other Republican predecessors, Seneca adopts every possible means of Romanizing Greek myth in order to underline the play's contemporary relevance.

How then should we define a Roman tragedy's relevance to contemporary politics? Both Accius' *Atreus* and Seneca's *Thyestes*, two of the most likely candidates for a political reading, present significant obstacles. Perhaps the most obvious is the lack of a precise date for each play. Although scholarly consensus accepts the evidence of Aulus Gellius as decisive and holds that *Atreus* belongs to the 130s BC, it is difficult to date the play with greater precision. Indeed Lana's argument that *Atreus* was first performed in 133 BC, the very year of Tiberius' tribunate, is plainly circular, for it is based on his anti-Gracchan reading of the play.³⁸ When we turn to *Thyestes*, we face similar difficulties. While there is evidence from stylometry³⁹ and from Seneca's use of historical allusion,⁴⁰ which suggests that *Thyestes* belongs to the 60s AD, that evidence is not strong enough to link the play to a particular year or even a particular reign.

It is possible, nevertheless, to link these plays to their political context in a more general way. I have argued above that the central character in *Atreus* is presented as a spokesman for tyranny and that the play is concerned with the nature of power. One striking feature of accounts of the political rhetoric in the 130s BC is precisely its focus on the concept of tyranny, with both Gracchus' supporters and opponents leveling this charge against their enemies. Cicero's *Laelius* claims that Tiberius Gracchus aimed at kingship (*regnum*, *De amicitia* 41), while Sallust's Memmius notes the same accusation (*Jugurtha* 31.7). Plutarch adds more detail, reporting that Tiberius risked being accused of tyranny by not attending the forum and that Scipio Nasica demanded that Tiberius be killed as a tyrant (*Tiberius Gracchus* 17, 19). But note, too, that Tiberius' supporters subsequently labeled Scipio a tyrant (*Tiberius Gracchus* 21). Whether Accius was associated with the *optimates*, as most recent

38 Lana (1958–9: 344–51).

39 Fitch (1981).

40 Nisbet (1990).

scholars believe,⁴¹ or whether he was not, a play on the subject of tyranny was clearly pertinent in the highly charged political atmosphere of the 130s BC.⁴²

If “tyranny” was a term to be hurled at one’s opponents in the 130s BC, it was a reality in the middle of the first century AD and so a focus for reflection in both poetry and prose. Consider, for example, the similarities between Seneca’s representation of Caligula in *De ira* and his representation of the tyrant in *Thyestes*:

Gaius Caesar, when he held in custody the son of Pastor, a distinguished Roman knight, because he had taken offence at his elegance and his excessively well-groomed hair, when the father asked that he should grant him his son’s salvation, as if being reminded about the punishment, ordered him to be led away immediately; but so that he would not act with complete inhumanity to the father, he invited him to dinner that same day. Pastor came with no sign of reproach upon his face. Caesar drank a small cup to his health and placed a guard over him: the wretch endured, as if he were drinking his son’s blood. He sent perfume and garlands and gave orders to watch whether he took them: he took them. On that day on which he had carried out his son for burial, actually on which he had not done so, he reclined as the one hundredth guest and the gout-ridden old man drained drinks which would hardly be respectable on his children’s birthdays, in the meantime not shedding a tear and not allowing grief to burst out by any sign; he dined as if he had pleaded for his son successfully. You ask why? He had another son.

(SENECA *DE IRA* 2.33)

The story bears a superficial resemblance to the plot of *Thyestes*. We have a tyrant and a father. There is a banquet and a dead son. Pastor even drinks as if he were drinking his son’s blood.

More important for our purposes, however, is representation of the psychology of the tyrant in both works. If we leave aside Caligula’s arbitrary cruelty (killing a man because of his hair, combining the execution of a son with an invitation to dinner), perhaps the tyrant’s most striking feature is his capacity for instilling fear, for he places Pastor in an intolerable situation, a situation in

41 Cf. Dangel (1995: 15–17); Baldarelli (2004: 22–34); Boyle (2006: 123–27). For a plainly overconfident statement of this position, cf. Biliński (1958). Manuwald (2001: 236–37) and (2011: 216–17) is more sceptical.

42 For assessment of the accusation of tyranny from an historical perspective, cf. Lintott (1994: 72–73).

which a grieving father must show no signs of grief, must even seem to celebrate his fortune. That Pastor must react as the emperor demands is reinforced by Caligula's sending observers to scrutinize Pastor's behavior. If we consider the victim, we can see that even without instruction, Pastor understands the rules. He knows that he must act as if nothing untoward had happened, that he must disguise his emotions, even when drinking heavily.

If we turn to Act 2 of *Thyestes* we see Atreus not only enunciates the theory behind Caligula's actions, but puts it into practice:

*maximum hoc regni bonum est,
quod facta domini cogitur populus sui
tam ferre quam laudare.*

(SEN. *THYESTES* 205–207)

This is kingship's greatest good, that the people are compelled to endure as much as praise their master's deeds.

Compare Pastor's situation. He must not only endure, but celebrate: he is compelled to wear a wreath and put on perfume. Indeed he is forced to embody one of Atreus' most striking paradoxes: *quod nolunt velint* (They must want what they do not want, 212). In Pastor's case he must want to seem cheerful when all his desire is to grieve. Although Seneca is not explicit on the source of Caligula's power in this section of *De ira*, he is explicit in the tragedy's second act, for the minister speaks of fear (*metus*, 207, 208). Moreover, as Calder points out,⁴³ we see the same phenomenon in the last two lines of Act 2 when the minister responds to Atreus' command by saying:

*haud sum monendus: ista nostro in pectore
fides timorque, sed magis claudet fides.*

(SEN. *THYESTES* 334–335)

I do not need warning: loyalty and fear will hide this in my heart, but mainly loyalty.

While the minister says that he is motivated by loyalty, we can be sure that it is fear that drives him.

There is a further parallel between Atreus and Caligula: both insist upon close inspection of their victim. Since Caligula's banquet is large, he must send

43 Calder (1976: 8–9). Cf. also Tarrant (1985: 136); Mader (1998: 32–33).

a guard to watch Pastor, to make sure that he accepts Caesar's gifts, to ensure that he shows no grief and appears to enjoy the banquet. If we turn to Atreus, we see that in Act 5 he orders the doors opened, for he longs to see Thyestes (*libet videre*, 903). In this case it is the sight of Thyestes' belch which leads Atreus to declare that he is "highest of gods and king of kings" (911–912). There are, however, differences. Unlike Pastor, Thyestes genuinely enjoys his feast, for while Pastor understands his predicament, Thyestes does not.

I would like to examine one more passage from *De ira*.

Just as Gaius Caesar, angry with heaven on the ground that it drowned out the sound of some pantomime artists, whom he imitated more eagerly than he watched, and because his own revelry was terrified by thunderbolts (clearly not well aimed), summoned Jupiter to a fight even to the death, exclaiming that verse from Homer: "Either lift me or I will lift you." What folly! He supposed either that he could not be harmed even by Jupiter or that he himself could harm even Jupiter. I do not suppose that this utterance of his added too little weight to inciting the minds of conspirators.

(SENECA *DE IRA* 1.20)

From Seneca's perspective an important aspect of Caligula's folly lies in the fact that he mixes the categories of human and divine, viewing himself as Jupiter's equal. If we turn to *Thyestes*, we find precisely the same confusion. In Act 4 the messenger describes Atreus as hesitating which of Thyestes' sons to sacrifice first to himself (*quem prius mactet sibi / dubitat*, 713–714), the implication being that Atreus views himself as both priest and god. By the beginning of Act 5 Atreus has moved beyond implication, seeing himself first as equal to the gods (*aequalis astris gradior*, 885) and then as their superior (*o me caelitem excelsissimum*, 911). There is, however, a significant difference between Caligula and Atreus. In *De ira* Seneca concludes with a reminder that aspiring to divinity led to conspiracy and Caligula's assassination. In *Thyestes* the gods are impotent in the face of Atreus' monstrous crime. There is, moreover, no conspiracy, no assassination: at the play's end Atreus stands triumphant.

And then there is Nero. While the existence of the pseudo-Senecan *Octavia* establishes that it is possible to rewrite *Thyestes* as a quasi-biographical account of Seneca's experiences with the emperor, the lack of firm chronological evidence for *Thyestes* makes such an interpretation hazardous. There is the additional difficulty that, not surprisingly, Seneca says very little in the prose works about the inner workings of Nero's court. On the other hand, it is not difficult to discern connections between Seneca's account of the nature of power

in *Thyestes* and the accounts of Nero's reign that we find in Tacitus, Suetonius and Dio. Central to the Senecan tragedy and to the historians, for example, are a focus on murderous rivalries within families (especially between brothers: Atreus and Thyestes in the play, Nero and Britannicus in the historians), an emphasis on the violation of fundamental human institutions like the feast (with Tacitus noting that Britannicus was murdered "amid the sacred ritual of the table", *inter sacra mensae*, *Annales* 13.17.9)⁴⁴ as well as the frequent enactment of Atreus' dictum that the tyrant's subjects must not only endure but praise their master's deeds (*Thyestes* 207: *tam ferre quam laudare*; cf. Tacitus *Annales* 14.10, 14.12, 14.13, 14.59, 14.60, and 14.64; Dio 63.10: καὶ ταῦτα μέντοι πάντα οἱ τε ἄλλοι πάντες καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται ὁρῶντες ἔφερον ἐπήνουν, Seeing all this, everyone, particularly the soldiers, endured and offered praise).

That Seneca's *Thyestes* presents a thoroughly Romanized world is clear. Equally clear is the fact that the play stages a tyrant at a time when concern with the nature of tyranny was a central preoccupation of Rome's political class. Whether that time was the reign of Caligula or the reign of Nero is not important for our understanding of the play, for like other ancient tragedies, *Thyestes* is not an allegory. But given the play's relationship to the Roman tragic tradition and its connections with Seneca's own reflections on politics and philosophy, connections made explicit in the second and third choral odes, it is difficult to avoid reading *Thyestes* as, among other things, a reflection on the nature of politics in late Julio-Claudian Rome.⁴⁵

44 For the violation of fundamental human institutions in *Thyestes*, cf. Boyle (1997: 46–48).

45 I would like to acknowledge the support of the Australian Research Council for this research.

PART 3

Interchange with Other Genres



Epic Elements in Senecan Tragedy

Annette M. Baertschi

Long graphic narratives feature prominently in Senecan tragedy. Ranging between 110 and 160 lines, these narratives often occupy a whole act and recount spectacular events, from the bloody death of Hippolytus in the *Phaedra* (1000–1114) to the necromancy in the *Oedipus* (530–658) to Atreus' slaughtering of Thyestes' sons in the *Thyestes* (641–788). While similar reports can be found in Attic tragedy, where a messenger regularly appears in pivotal moments to relate important action that has occurred offstage, the messenger speeches in Senecan drama differ considerably from their Greek counterparts, both in terms of scope and narrative voice. Not only are they much longer, mostly because of the large amount of description that is included, but they are also frequently completely impersonal accounts, whereas the Greek tragic messenger usually emphasizes his own participation and emotional involvement in the events he is narrating. Seneca's messengers thus, whether they are actual messengers or characters serving the same dramatic purpose, resemble epic narrators, whose voice is disassociated from any particular point of view. Moreover, on the thematic level, their speeches often deal with typical set-pieces of epic poetry such as the description of the sea storm that destroyed the Greek fleet on its return voyage from Troy in the *Agamemnon* (421–578), the afore-mentioned necromancy in the *Oedipus* (530–658), or the portrayal of the underworld in the *Hercules furens* (662–827).

The incorporation of epic elements and narrative strategies is not the only aspect in which Senecan drama diverges from the theatrical conventions of fifth-century Greek tragedy. Rather, his plays show a number of formal characteristics that do not have any parallels in the surviving corpus of Attic tragedy, for instance, the separation of the chorus from the dramatic action, the display of brutal murder and other horrible crimes on stage, or the so-called 'running commentaries', that is, passages in which "the emotions, actions, or physical appearance of a character are described by the chorus or by another actor in the third person".¹ However, while these add to the controversial nature of Senecan tragedy and the often unfavorable assessment of the author as dramatist, none has made modern critics question more intensely whether Seneca's tragedies were or could be staged and whether they are really drama at all than

¹ Zanobi (2014: 91).

the pervasive presence of long ecphrastic narratives. The main reason for this is that extended descriptions suspend dramatic time and ‘freeze’ the action, thus obstructing the advancement of the plot. In addition, Seneca’s tendency to include information that does not seem directly pertinent to the play and to elaborate on details, again in contrast to Greek tragedy, underscores the digressive character of his messenger scenes and makes them appear like independent episodes.

Fortunately, the apparent lack of proportion and coherence of Seneca’s messenger speeches is no longer seen as a sign of the author’s dramaturgical incompetence or rhetorical self-indulgence. On the contrary, it has been recognized that they are an integral part of each tragedy, crystallizing important motifs and themes, and not merely tacked on as “pieces of virtuoso entertainment, *purpurei panni* with no particular relevance to their contexts.”² Similarly, it has long become unfashionable to interpret Seneca’s predilection for supernatural events and gruesome death as evidence of his fascination with the occult or his “pathetic ‘love of horrors.’”³ At the same time, it is hardly surprising that scholars have used the existence of long epic narratives in almost all of Seneca’s tragedies as an argument that they were written for recitation rather than stage production, since expansive descriptions seem redundant and out of place in a dramatic performance. In a recital, however, they fulfil a specific function, namely to establish the setting and atmosphere of the tragic action, just as ecphraseis in epic enable the reader (or listener) to visualize and emotionally connect with the characters and events of the story told. Furthermore, it has been claimed that Seneca imported the “alien technique” of detailed, pictorial description into his tragic corpus in order “to present his ‘view’ of the action [...] in a figurative as well as literal sense” and to achieve some “authorial control over the audience’s understanding” of the play’s moral significance.⁴

While both these interpretations assume that Seneca was not tightly bound by theatrical considerations when composing his tragedies, a very recent study suggests that he was in fact very much concerned with questions of performance and dramatic effect and deliberately adopted the aesthetics and features of pantomime in his plays.⁵ Pantomime, a mute solo dance based on a tragic script that was sung by a chorus or a soloist, was an immensely popular form of entertainment in the early empire. Sadly, no pantomimic libretto has

2 Larson (1994: 135).

3 Faber (2007: 428), quoting Butler (1909: 49).

4 Larson (1994: 53, 135).

5 Zanobi (2014); cf. also Zanobi (2010) and (2008). The idea was first proposed by Zimmermann (1990).

survived from antiquity and so it is difficult to know what these scripts looked like; but they seem to have dealt with mythological themes, adapting material “from the best epic and tragic poets of the past” (cf. Lucian, *De saltatione* 61), although they probably did not recount an entire myth, but focused on the most exciting and sensational moments. Additionally, pantomime placed great emphasis on the portrayal of emotional conflict and violent passions such as love, grief, anger, madness, and desire for revenge and also made spectacular killings and punishments the core of its show.⁶ Overall, pantomime was characterized by a similar “hybrid mixture” of narrative and dramatic as Senecan tragedy,⁷ with the chorus or soloist telling the story and ‘setting the stage’ by means of ecphrastic description and the dancer enacting the song through movement, gesture, and facial expression.

It is intriguing to think that Seneca appropriated typical elements and practices of pantomime in his tragedies or at least wrote his plays with them in mind, no matter how speculative this hypothesis must remain in light of the paucity of contemporary sources. This would not only explain the frequent integration of extended descriptions, but also other formal peculiarities like the remarkable looseness of the dramatic structure and the prioritizing of individual scenes, the fluidity of settings, and the presence of ‘running commentaries’, which have long puzzled readers and fuelled the debate about the performability of Senecan drama. Obviously, Seneca’s engagement with pantomime does not mean that he necessarily intended his tragedies to be staged or to be performed with pantomimic sequences; in fact, he may have written them in a way that allowed for both recitation and (full-scale) performance of any type, with or without musical accompaniment and mimetic dance. But the assumption of an influence of the aesthetics of pantomime highlights Seneca’s awareness of and interest in other performative genres and their reception in imperial Rome. Furthermore, it showcases his “continuous effort to experiment”⁸ and to explore the dramaturgic possibilities of the contemporary theatrical repertoire in order to enhance the impact of his plays.

The emphasis on Seneca’s experimentation with different features and conventions, both from ‘high’ and ‘low’ entertainment culture, is all the more important, as his tragedies are not a monolithic entity, but a “formally diverse” body of texts.⁹ At the same time, it is equally important to remember that his striving for generic enrichment is not limited to performative media, but also

6 Cf. Zanobi (2014: 12–17); cf. also Fugmann (1988: 21–23 [= (2013) 33–36]).

7 Larson (1994: 53).

8 Buckley (2013: 205).

9 Boyle (1987: 86).

includes literature, specifically non-dramatic literature. The complex literary ancestry of Senecan tragedy and the dense web of intertexts that permeates each play are well known. Vergil, Horace, and Ovid are constant presences, and the creative—and critical—engagement with their works in addition to Euripides and other (Greek) tragedians is central to the understanding not only of the polygeneric nature of Senecan drama, but also its particular poetics. It is therefore essential to appreciate Senecan tragedy both as a literary *and* a theatrical art form. Whether it was ever staged during the author's lifetime or just publicly recited (again, in full or in part), there can be no doubt that an audience as literate as that of Neronian Rome would think immediately of the *Aeneid* when watching or hearing, for example, a play that contains a long description of the underworld like the *Hercules furens*. Even “those who never read the text [...] are not miraculously insulated from the interpretations of literate directors and spectators, and from anything touched by those interpretations.”¹⁰ Conversely, if Seneca's main focus was not on the performance but on the publication of his tragedies, since only a written copy would enable readers fully to grasp their intertextual dimension, it is unlikely that they did not envisage some form of theatrical enactment or production, especially given the popularity of performative genres such as pantomime, which shared many of the thematic concerns and narrative modes of Senecan drama. In short, “performance and reading must be seen ‘not as polar opposites but as each implicated in the other’.”¹¹

In the following, I would thus like to offer a re-assessment of Seneca's messenger scenes taking into account the complexity of literary as well as dramatic factors that shapes their form and meaning. First, I will discuss the role and status of the Greek tragic messenger and show that Seneca adopts and further develops the practices of Attic drama to enhance the narrative authority of his *nuntii*. Second, I will demonstrate that Seneca not only endows his messengers with an epic voice and frequently reworks literary topics typical of the epic tradition, but in fact hyper-epicizes¹² their orations by expanding and elaborating conventional features such as descriptions of places, catalogs, and (extended) similes. Simultaneously, he often dramatizes the reports by including direct speeches, another characteristic of epic to increase the realism and immediacy of the narrative. The goal of this, I will argue, is to maximize the *enargeia* of the messenger's account and to transform it into an imaginary spectacle, thus enhancing its visual and emotional effect. I will further claim that in bringing

10 Littlewood (2004: 4).

11 Fowler (unpublished), quoted by Littlewood (2004: 4).

12 For the term cf. Janka (2004: 49, 54).

the subject vividly before the (inner) eyes of the audience Seneca may be co-opting the aesthetics of pantomime, which also used ecphrastic description to prompt or support the spectator's visualization. Finally, I will show that the long pictorial speeches that Seneca's messengers deliver not only are essential for the thematic development of the plays, adding to their imaginative and structural unity, but also have an important interpretive function. They shape the viewer's (and reader's) perception of the subsequent dramatic action and enable him to recognize its truly horrific nature, surpassing both the terrifying events depicted by the *nuntius* and in the literary models emulated. In contrast to Brecht's epic theater, which seeks to prevent a strong affective response to the characters and situation portrayed through alienation (*Verfremdung*) and provoke critical reflection instead, Seneca's tragedies appeal to the rational as well as emotional faculties of the audience. They provide visual and verbal, sensory and cognitive stimuli and lead to learning and philosophical insight through shocking and unsettling closeness. In my discussion, I will focus in particular on the *Agamemnon* and, to a lesser degree, on the *Hercules furens*, since their messenger speeches re-enact two 'classic' themes of epic poetry, but occasionally also touch on other works.

1 The Messenger as Epic Narrator

The messenger is a familiar figure on the ancient tragic stage and usually manages to leave a distinctive mark on the audience's memory, even though his presence may be limited. But the fact that he regularly reports terrible disasters and abominable crimes and, more importantly, that he is able to provide an eyewitness account secures him special attention. By stressing the authenticity of his information, the messenger establishes his credentials as narrator and distinguishes his voice from that of other characters similarly laying claim to truth and authority. He is the only one who is completely impartial and objective, concerned solely with relating mere facts; as a consequence, his speech is commonly accepted as presenting an "authoritative (and authorial) view of events."¹³ However, while the messenger's ability to give an accurate and disinterested account of what happened offstage makes him an extradiegetic rather than an intradiegetic narrator, he still functions as a character in the play and in his report "must negotiate the tensions that result from his ambiguous position."¹⁴ In particular, he must overcome the limitations inher-

13 Trinacty (2014: 166).

14 Barrett (2002: 73).

ent in his status as eyewitness—he can only tell what he has seen depending on his location at the time of the action—in order to suppress potential reservations about the veracity of his account.

As recent studies have shown, the Attic tragedians use different strategies to deal with the messenger's role as focalizer and his inevitably restricted and partial point of view, especially when the site of the events that he claims to have witnessed is large, for example, an enormous battlefield. Euripides usually takes care in such cases either to locate the messenger on a high vantage point to afford him as wide as possible a perspective (panoramic or bird's eye view) or to guarantee him an "ambulant position" to allow for coverage of an extended area (scenic view).¹⁵ Another approach to enhancing the messenger's credibility is used by Aeschylus in the *Persians*. Here the messenger relating the Persians' defeat in the sea-battle of Salamis (*Persians* 249–514) describes both the general struggle of the Persian fleet after having been caught in the narrow channel and the death of individual leaders, providing specific visual details. In other words, he places himself alternately at a considerable distance from the action, whence he can "oversee the totality of events",¹⁶ and at close proximity, focusing on different characters or objects within the scene.¹⁷ In combining a panoramic and a scenic (or close-up) standpoint the messenger's spatial perspective equals omnipresence, which underscores the legitimacy of his report.

At the same time, the messenger in the *Persians* minimizes his own participation in the naval battle and recedes into the background.¹⁸ He uses predominantly third-person predicates and impersonal constructions, avoiding references to his person,¹⁹ and moves around as an invisible witness; often he disappears completely from the narrative so that the events seem independent from an observer. In (implicitly) suggesting both omnipresence and non-presence the messenger's voice closely resembles that of the epic poet, who likewise positions himself freely within the location he is describing, and yet appears nowhere in the (fictional) scene. The affiliation with epic liberates the messenger's account from the partiality that defines the speech of the

15 de Jong (1991: 13); for a typology of narratorial standpoints, cf. de Jong/Nünlist (2004: 64–67).

16 de Jong/Nünlist (2004: 65).

17 Cf. Barrett (2002: 32–34).

18 Cf. Barrett (2002: 34–40).

19 Line 502 (*ēmōn*) is the exception that proves the rule. On the four occurrences of first-person plural forms, cf. Barrett (2002: 37, n. 24).

other characters on stage and establishes his authority in the many competing claims to truthfulness.

Seneca was well aware of the literary practices of fifth-century Greek drama to mediate the tensions arising from the messenger's double status as character and extradiegetic narrator. This is evident from the messenger speech in the *Agamemnon*, the longest in the Senecan corpus, which describes the sea storm that destroyed the Greek fleet on its way home from Troy (*Agamemnon* 421–578). The narrative takes up almost the entire third act and covers not only the actual storm, but also the death of Ajax Oileus at the hands of Athena and Neptune (*Agamemnon* 528–556) and the treachery of Nauplius, who lured the Greek ships onto the Capherean rocks at the coast of Euboea by lighting beacons at the top (*Agamemnon* 557–576). While there are (tragic) sources from the Hellenistic period that similarly connect the three episodes and may have served as Seneca's models,²⁰ many scholars have criticized his account for being disproportionately long, especially when compared with the report of the herald in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, who with great economy informs the chorus about the storm's shipwrecking and the escape of Agamemnon's vessel before speculating about Menelaus' fate (*Agamemnon* 650–679). Moreover, it was objected that the messenger, whose name is Eurybates, relates much more than he possibly could have seen in the darkness of the night on board of one of the ships,²¹ thus reflecting Seneca's predilection for rhetorical elaboration and literary emulation at the expense of theatrical plausibility.

However, even though it cannot be denied that Seneca draws heavily on earlier (epic) storm descriptions for his own treatment of the topic,²² he is also conscious of the messenger's dramatic function "as 'stand-in' spectator"²³ and employs the same strategies as Aeschylus in the *Persians* to forge the former's narrative authority. In fact, the account of the Persian runner, itself constituting the longest messenger scene in extant Greek tragedy and similarly describing the devastation of a large fleet, may have been one of Seneca's main source texts. For just like the Persian messenger in Aeschylus, Eurybates sees on a scale both large and small. His portrayal of the storm's damaging effects on the ships (*Agamemnon* 497–506), for example, indicates a broad sweep of vision,

20 For a detailed discussion cf. Tarrant (1976: 21–22).

21 Cf. Schindler (2000: 138); cf. also Stackmann (1949: 210).

22 Cf. in particular Verg. *Aen.* 1.81–156 and 3.192–208 as well as Ov. *Met.* 11.474–572. In tragedy, cf. the celebrated storm narrative in Pacuvius' *Teucer*, with which Seneca shares several distinctive elements; cf. Tarrant (1976: 20). On the epic tradition of storm descriptions in general, cf. Morford (1967: 20–36) and Friedrich (1956: 77–87).

23 de Jong (1991: 13).

whereas a detail like Ajax “straining on the ropes to shorten sail” (*Agamemnon* 533–534: *vela cogentem hunc sua / tento rudente*),²⁴ when he is struck by the first of Athena’s lightning bolts, signals a close proximity to the action and thus a much narrower scope. At the same time, Eurybates obscures his own involvement in the events—again exactly like his Greek counterpart—and tells of the destruction of the fleet as if he was not present at all. His entire speech, more than 150 lines, contains only one self-reference (*Agamemnon* 557: *nos alia maior naufragos pestis vocat*)²⁵ and otherwise consists exclusively of third-person predicates and impersonal constructions. He simply speaks of *miles* (*Agamemnon* 423, cf. also *Agamemnon* 444), when the Greeks prepare for their departure, in no way revealing that he was among the soldiers. Similarly, when the ships are already at sea, he mentions that “the whole army was eager to flex the oars as they pulled together, assisting the winds” (*Agamemnon* 437–438: *properat iuventus omnis adductos simul / lentare remos, adiuuat ventos manu*), once more not acknowledging that he was included in this group.²⁶ Finally, when describing the despair of his fellow-sailors in the raging storm—they drop their equipment, paralyzed by fear and terror, and beseech the gods to save them, Greeks and Trojans alike (*Agamemnon* 508–511)—he reports their prayer in direct speech (*Agamemnon* 517–526), implying that he was close enough to hear it. Yet, tellingly, he suppresses all reference to his specific location and thus secures himself a safe exit, for when a torrent of water washes away the men, abruptly cutting off their supplication (*Agamemnon* 527), he alone escapes the disaster.

By assuming a variety of perspectives amounting to omnipresence and simultaneously concealing his own participation, Eurybates speaks with the voice of an epic poet just like the messenger in Aeschylus’ *Persians*. Eurybates’ freedom of movement within the scene together with his invisibility (and invulnerability) suggests that he stands outside of the narrative and gives a “rational account of objective fact”,²⁷ thus emphasizing the reliability of his information. At the same time, Seneca makes sure to maintain the dramatic illusion and enhance Eurybates’ credibility as an eyewitness by creating as realistic as

24 All translations of Seneca’s tragedies are taken from Fitch (2002–2004).

25 Cf. *Pers.* 502.

26 In addition, he often uses the passive, fading out the person(s) who perform(s) a task. Thus the “oars are fitted to the soldiers’ hands” (*Ag.* 425: *ad militares remus aptatur manus*) or “the ship is trusted to the wind” (*Ag.* 443: *credita est vento ratis*). Likewise, things—and not men—repeatedly initiate action, e.g., *signum* (*Ag.* 427), *tuba* (*Ag.* 428), *aurata . . . prora* (*Ag.* 429), *aura . . . lenis* (*Ag.* 431), etc.

27 Barlow (1971: 61).

possible a scenario. Although critics have complained that he relates events that he could not have observed himself given that it was pitch dark during the night of the storm, a closer examination reveals that Seneca was careful to allay any doubts on the part of the spectator (and reader) about the authenticity of Eurybates' speech. Granted, he repeatedly highlights the impenetrable darkness of the night (*Agamemnon* 470, 472–474, 486–487), which made the men's fate worse because they were unable to see what destroyed them (*Agamemnon* 491–494). However, he also points out that some light nevertheless illuminated the scene, as flashes of lightning broke through the infernal gloom (*Agamemnon* 494–495: *excidunt ignes tamen / et nube dirum fulmen elisa micat*), bringing much-desired moments of brightness (*Agamemnon* 496–497) and allowing him to recognize the damage done to the ships (cf. *Agamemnon* 497–506).

Similarly, Seneca sets the stage for the death of Ajax, prompting the audience's visual imagination at the beginning of the passage with *ecce alia clades* (*Agamemnon* 528). Renewing the storm with the help of her father's thunderbolts, Athena strikes Ajax's ship and breaks it into two parts (*Agamemnon* 528–538). Yet, despite being surrounded by blazing flames (*Agamemnon* 540: *ambustus*), he sails on "standing out from the saltwater like a lofty crag" (*Agamemnon* 539–540)—a spectacle that Eurybates is able to perceive because the burning shipwreck provides the necessary light. Finally, as Ajax clings more tightly to his ship, he catches fire himself and becomes a living torch (*Agamemnon* 541–543: *et navem manu / complexus ignes traxit et caeco mari / conlucet Aiax; omne resplendet fretum*), before he is eventually drowned by Neptune, who dislodges the rock on which he had taken refuge (*Agamemnon* 544, 553–556). Eurybates' report therefore does not lack all probability, as has been claimed, since he could not have witnessed Ajax's death in the black of the night. Rather, Seneca takes care both to overcome the messenger's visual restrictions and to give Ajax an appropriate ending by having the Greek hero die in full spotlight, obvious to see for everyone present.

2 *Enargeia* in Seneca's Messenger Scenes

The messenger scene in the *Agamemnon* is not an isolated phenomenon. On the contrary, Seneca regularly casts his messengers as epic narrators who deliver their speeches in an almost completely impersonal way as if detached from the events they are describing. In the *Phaedra*, for example, the *nuntius* reporting Hippolytus' death hints only once at his presence when he comments on his reaction to the sea's uproar before the emergence of the monster

(*Phaedra* 1025–1026: *haec dum stupentes quaerimus, en totum mare / immugit, omnes undique scopuli adstrepunt*). The “first-person perspective [...] intrudes so abruptly that it is not totally clear to whom the ‘we’ refers.”²⁸ By contrast, the messenger in Euripides’ *Hippolytus* identifies himself as one of the hero’s servants and repeatedly alludes to his own actions (cf. *Hippolytus* 1173, 1187, 1195–1197, 1198, 1204, 1219), while also highlighting his autopsy (cf. *Hippolytus* 1206–1208, 1216, 1240). Moreover, he gives specific information regarding the setting, namely the shore at Troezen where he and the other attendants were combing and scraping Hippolytus’ horses (*Hippolytus* 1173, 1179, 1199, 1206). In Seneca’s *Phaedra*, the messenger omits these details and situates the events more vaguely in the countryside outside of Athens whence Hippolytus is fleeing (*Phaedra* 1000–1003, 1050–1054), without defining his own spatial coordinates or explaining his role.

Likewise, Theseus in his long description of the underworld in the *Hercules furens* (*Hercules furens* 662–827) does not reveal his location and hence his particular point of view. He only briefly mentions his rescue by Hercules and his assistance in dragging Cerberus to the upper world at the end of the speech (*Hercules furens* 806, 818–821), but throughout the rest of the report “all his replies [to Amphitryon’s questions] begin with a new *ecphrasis topou*, which [...] neither reflects nor delimits the initial position of the characters [...] in the space.”²⁹ He also does not speak of his personal experience apart from expressing his horror at recounting the dreadful events at the very beginning (*Hercules furens* 646–649, 650–651), as is typical for tragic messengers before embarking on their narrative.³⁰ As a figure, Theseus thus remains “resolutely undeveloped”³¹ and seems introduced solely for the purpose of relating Hercules’ last and most dangerous labor. Consequently, he leaves the stage soon after and only re-appears for a short moment in the final act to offer Hercules sanctuary in Athens (*Hercules furens* 1341–1344)—quite in contrast to the end of Euripides’ *Heracles*, where he plays a much more prominent part (cf. *Heracles* 1163–1428). In addition, his speech is essentially a monologue, as Amphitryon’s questions seem primarily intended to enable him to move from one topic to another without having to provide “linking transitions between the different sections.”³²

28 Segal (1984: 315); cf. also Liebermann (1974: 38). On the disputed reading of *Ph.* 1025, cf. Coffey/Mayer (1990: 179 *ad loc.*).

29 Zanobi (2008: 243); cf. Zanobi (2014: 155).

30 Cf. Tarrant (1976: 254) on *Ag.* 416–420 for examples from Greek tragedy. In Seneca cf. also *Ph.* 991–992, 995; *Oed.* 223–224, 511; *Med.* 670; *Tro.* 168–170, 1056–1059; *Thy.* 634–638.

31 Henry/Walker (1965: 19).

32 Zanobi (2014: 155); cf. Zanobi (2008: 243) and also Shelton (1978: 51); *pace* Kugelmeier (2007: 125).

Finally, in the messenger scene in the *Thyestes*, which goes “further than any other play in the direction of dialogue”,³³ featuring the chorus as a speaking character, the *nuntius* relaying Atreus’ murder and dismemberment of Thyestes’ sons (*Thyestes* 641–788) also does not engage in a proper conversation. On the contrary, once the chorus manages to overcome his traditional, if exaggerated reluctance to report the dreadful news (*Thyestes* 623–640), he begins his narrative with an elaborate description of the grove in which the killings took place (*Thyestes* 641–682). At the same time, he does not indicate his own position nor disclose how he was able to witness the slaughtering that was conducted in the innermost part of the palace (*Thyestes* 652: *penetrare regni*) or why he did not attempt to restrain Atreus, if he was indeed present. Once again the messenger here speaks as an extradiegetic narrator rather than a *dramatis persona* who was involved in the action he is relating. In fact, while he is initially overwhelmed by fear and disgust and can barely grasp the enormity of the crime, he gets more and more swept up in the fervor of his speech and seems to relish telling the horrific story, so much so that he responds with irony and black humor to the chorus’s question who Atreus killed first (*Thyestes* 718–719: *primus locus (ne desse pietatem putes) / avo dicatur: Tantalus prima hostia est*).³⁴ Finally, by concluding his account—in good epic fashion—with an apostrophe to Thyestes feasting on the dead bodies of his children (*Thyestes* 782–783), the messenger reminds the audience that he acts as an omniscient poet and not as a “mere reporter”.³⁵

While the depersonalization of the messenger is a conventional license of Attic tragedy, as shown above, and serves to legitimize his report by assimilating him to the epic narrator, Seneca not only endows his messenger figures with an epic voice, but also makes frequent use of epic themes and tropes in their individual speeches. He often chooses typical epic set-pieces such as descriptions of storms, evocations of the dead, descents to the underworld, sacrifices and other forms of divination. More importantly, he regularly incorporates characteristic epic features like ecphrases, catalogs, and (extended) similes into his messenger narratives. Indeed, he hyper-epicizes them by expanding and elaborating these elements—the *descriptio loci* in the *Thyestes*, for instance,

33 Tarrant (1985: 180).

34 Cf. Tarrant (1985: 180): “From an initial state of nearly speechless horror, the Messenger grows steadily more involved with his narrative, becoming at last almost buoyant in displaying his powers of description. By the latter part of the scene he has absorbed Atreus’ flair for the ironic retort, and in his final lines he sounds as jubilantly confident as Atreus himself that the crime can no longer be suppressed.” On the change of the messenger’s perspective in the course of his account, cf. also Winter (2014: 152–168).

35 Tarrant (1985: 203).

is more than forty lines long and the messenger's account in the *Phaedra* contains five similes as opposed to only two in Euripides' *Hippolytus*—and in addition repeatedly includes direct speeches, another hallmark of epic poetry.

Past scholarship has usually criticized Seneca's embellished style and seen it either as evidence of his rhetorical showmanship, reflecting the influence of the contemporary declamation schools, or his obsessive engagement with the literary past, or both. Furthermore, it was pointed out that the descriptive passages "increase the bulk of the speech but not its impact",³⁶ even though it was recognized that they add to the thematic and structural unity of the respective play.³⁷ However, I would like to argue that Seneca's ecphrastic rhetoric enhances the effect of his messenger speeches by inviting the audience's imaginative and emotional involvement. The central function of ecphrasis is to bring a subject vividly before the eyes of the listener (or reader) in order to create a sense of immediacy of the event or thing described as well as to generate a strong affective response and "a degree of immersion" into the envisioned scene.³⁸ By amplifying traditional epic features such as *ecphraseis topou* and similes, Seneca stimulates the spectator's (and reader's) powers of imagination and enables him to see in his mind the places, people, and actions not directly visible on stage. The hyper-epic elements help to maximize the *enargeia* of Seneca's messenger narratives and transform them into illusionist spectacles, thus heightening both their visual appeal and their emotive force. Simultaneously, the pictorial language and use of specific epic motifs engage the audience's cognitive skills, as I will demonstrate in the final section of this paper, and sharpen their view of the dramatic events unfolding before them.

Obviously, such a reading reinforces the strong rhetorical background of Senecan tragedy. But "[r]ather than simply observing, and then dismissing, rhetoric as the source of mannerism and verbal pyrotechnics (though it was certainly that), we might more productively argue that rhetoric—in particular declamation—was a positive influence on Roman tragedy",³⁹ ensuring its successful functioning as theater. Similarly, the affiliation with epic showcases Seneca's intense confrontation—and exploitation—of the literary tradition and his predilection for the blending of genres in order to enrich the intertextual dialogue with earlier (Roman) poetry. That said, the particular narra-

36 Coffey/Mayer (1990: 176).

37 Cf., e.g., Faber (2007), Mader (2002), Boyle (1985), Davis (1983), and Shelton (1983).

38 Bartsch/Elsner (2007: v). On ecphrasis as a rhetorical technique, cf. Webb (2009); on the concept of *enargeia*, cf. esp. 87–106.

39 Goldberg (1996: 276).

tive mode of Seneca's messenger speeches may additionally be indebted to popular forms of entertainment fashionable in the early empire. Specifically, it may reflect the aesthetics and practices of pantomime, which like Senecan drama amalgamated features and topics from different literary genres by using libretti that excerpted "the best epic and tragic poets of the past" (cf. Lucian, *De saltatione* 61).

In all of the works discussed above, the messenger (or character fulfilling the same role) lacks dramatic reality and serves as a mere mouthpiece for the story similar to the speaking voice of the chorus or soloist in pantomimic performances.⁴⁰ Besides, just as the latter 'sets the stage' for the tale enacted by way of ecphrastic description, so Seneca's messengers portray the respective location in a detailed and often graphic way, usually at the beginning of their speech, yet without necessarily aiming at accuracy or naturalism or providing concrete spatial or temporal coordinates. Rather, they "create an 'imaginary frame', within which [the] characters move",⁴¹ designed to define the venue as much as the general atmosphere. In pantomime, the depiction of an imaginary setting or background was all the more important, as it allowed to expand the scenic space and to transcend the physical and material constraints imposed by the contemporary theatrical conditions. By constructing a "verbal scenery",⁴² more impressionistic and evocative than specific, through the libretto sung by the chorus or soloist, the pantomimic show could take place in a more open and fluid environment. At the same time, the skilful dancer could translate the "verbal into bodily images by means of allusive gestures and movements".⁴³ It is therefore not surprising that encounters with the underworld were a favored subject in the thematic repertoire of pantomime (cf. Lucian, *De saltatione* 60), since the representation of the subterranean landscape and the mythical figures and demonic creatures inhabiting it enabled the dancer to display the full range of his artistic vocabulary.

Seneca's messenger speeches also extend the imaginative field of vision beyond the confines of the theater and make the audience picture in their mind the locale in which the events that are being related occurred. Even more, they induce the spectator (and reader) to believe to be present at the scene and to witness the action described, thus increasing its dramatic and emotional power. While it may be tempting to think that the messenger included pantomimic elements in his report to prompt the listener's visualization, this must

40 Cf. Zanobi (2014: 156, 168–169) and (2008: 243). also Zanobi (2008: 243).

41 Zanobi (2014: 150).

42 Lada-Richards (2007: 39).

43 Zanobi (2014: 150).

remain pure speculation, not least because Seneca may have envisaged several different forms of production for his tragedies, from full-scale performance to (partial) recitation, so that this could not have been guaranteed. In fact, concrete enactment can sometimes be counterproductive,⁴⁴ and so it is probably more likely that he relied on the efficacy of his language to stir the audience's imagination, "avoiding the visual competition of the stage."⁴⁵ But his striving to create a type of narrative that "worked an immediate impact on the mind of the listener, sparking mental images of the subjects it 'placed before the eyes'"⁴⁶ seems to indicate a consideration, if not co-option of the aesthetics of pantomime. At all events, Seneca's verbal spectacles attest to his awareness of the practices established by a cognate performative medium and the artistic and dramaturgic possibilities it offered by crossing—and re-crossing—generic boundaries.

3 Hyper-Epic Elements in Seneca's *Agamemnon* and *Hercules furens*

Eurybates' account of the sea storm that overtook the Greek fleet on its return voyage from Troy in the *Agamemnon* illustrates well Seneca's tendency to hyper-epicize his messenger speeches in order to involve the audience imaginatively and emotionally in the action reported. Eurybates begins his narrative with a prolonged description of the Greeks' preparations for departure and the subsequent period of calm sailing (*Agamemnon* 421–455). He first relates the soldiers' hurry to make their vessels ready for casting off and then portrays in great detail the excellent conditions they encounter at sea and the joyous atmosphere on board of the ships (*Agamemnon* 421–430, 431–441, esp. 435–436: *iuvat videre nuda Troiae litora, / iuvat relictis sola Sigei loca*). The weather is fair, the waters are placid, and the gentle breeze that billows the sails only turns into so strong a wind that the men can soon set down the oars and indulge in contemplating the landscape or telling each other war anecdotes before witnessing the appearance of a group of dolphins (*Agamemnon* 442–455).⁴⁷

The initial phase of smooth sailing and the seemingly ideal circumstances are also frequently mentioned at the beginning of epic storm descriptions, but are usually dealt with in just a few lines (cf., e.g., Vergil *Aeneid* 1.35: *vela dabant*

44 Cf. Liebermann in Damschen & Heil (2013: 407).

45 Fantham (2000: 23).

46 Webb (2009: 193).

47 On the suspense created by the intertextual resonances of *Aeneid* 2, cf. Caviglia (1986–1987: 146–150).

laeti et spumas salis aere ruebant; cf. also Ovid *Metamorphoses* 11.474–477). By contrast, Seneca enlarges the topic and converts it into a full-blown ecphrasis depicting a maritime *locus amoenus*,⁴⁸ the serenity of which is thrown into even sharper relief by the black smoke rising from the ruins of Troy in the background (*Agamemnon* 458–459). Needless to say, the precise description of the Greeks' departure and the numerous specifics provided enhance Eurybates' authority as narrator, since they corroborate his (implicit) claim to autopsy and convince the audience of the veracity of his account. But more importantly, the pictorial quality of his speech enables the spectator (and reader) to envision the events he is being told in his mind. The vividness of the report places him in the situation of a (virtual) eyewitness and makes him share not only the messenger's experience, but also the Greeks' pleasant journey and feelings of elation, as they distance themselves—both physically and emotionally—from the horrors of the Trojan War.

The same elaboration of a traditional element to facilitate the audience's visualization can be observed in the portrayal of the outbreak of the storm and the struggle of the winds. While in epic there is generally only a brief summary description of the effects of the winds on the sea (cf., e.g., Homer *Odyssey* 5.295–298, Vergil *Aeneid* 1.82–86 and 3.196–197, as well as Ovid *Metamorphoses* 11.490–491: *omnique e parte feroces bella gerunt venti fretaque indignantia miscent*), Seneca once more expands and intensifies the motif by casting the winds' fight “as one between personified entities”⁴⁹ and depicting the individual activity of each. “Winds fell upon the sea from all quarters at once, and churned it up violently from its very bed, Zephyrus against Eurys and Notus against Boreas. At war, each hurling his own weapons, they heaved up the waters in a whirling tornado. Strymonian Aquilo swirled deep snows; Libyan Auster buffeted the sandy Syrtes, with rain swelling the waves; Eurys struck the East, shaking Nabatean kingdoms and the gulfs of the Dawn—not to mention frenzied Corus, raising his head from Ocean” (*Agamemnon* 474–484).⁵⁰ The clash of the winds attacking from all four cardinal directions underscores the

48 Cf. Wessels (2014: 193).

49 Zanobi (2014: 197).

50 *undique incumbunt simul / rapiuntque pelagus infimo eversum solo / adversus Euro Zephyrus et Boreae Notus. / sua quisque mittunt tela et infesti fretum / emoliantur, turbo convolvit mare: / Strymonius altis Aquilo contorquet nives / Libycusque harenas Auster ac Syrtes agit, / imbre auget undas; Eurys orientem movet / Nabataea quatiens regna et Eoos sinus. / quid rabidus ora Corus Oceano exerens?* On the textual difficulty of *Ag.* 481, cf. Tarrant (1976: 266–267 *ad loc.*); cf. also Pyplacz (2009: 46–47) on the close verbal parallels between *Sen. Ag.* 474–484 and *Verg. Aen.* 1.82–86, 102–112.

cosmic dimension of the storm, which seems to make the world relapse into primordial chaos (*Agamemnon* 485–487: *mundum revelli sedibus totum suis / ipsosque rupto crederes caelo deos / decidere et atrum rebus induci chaos*). At the same time, the personification of the natural phenomena heightens their appeal to the imagination and allows the listener (and reader) to create a precise mental picture of the cataclysm brought about by winds, waves, and rain.

This is further supported by the description of the damage done to the ships in the following section (*Agamemnon* 497–506), which is characterized by similar detail and animation, running like a film scene before the inner eye of the spectator. Moreover, the striking mimetic effects of the passage, both sonic and syntactical, add to the illusion of immediate visual perception. For instance, in Eurybates' account of the ships' collision and mutual obstruction during the storm (*Agamemnon* 497–498: *ipsa se classis premit / et prora prorae nocuit et lateri latus*), the "juxtaposition of *prora prorae* and *lateri latus* [illustrates] the actual battering of ship on ship", while the repeated *pr*-sound in *premit / et prora prorae* "emphasizes the pounding of the beleaguered vessels."⁵¹ Likewise, the repeated use of enjambement (cf. *Agamemnon* 500, 502, 504) mirrors the foundering of the ships as well as the general confusion and destruction caused by the turmoil of the winds.

But Seneca's hyper-epicizing not only aims at turning the listener (and reader) into a virtual eyewitness by means of vivid evocation and imagery. The Roman dramatist also seeks to enhance the emotive power of Eurybates' report through incorporation of direct speech. The middle part of his narrative portraying the reaction of the men caught in the storm and the death of Ajax (*Agamemnon* 507–556) contains two direct speeches, which together take up almost a third of the account. As is well known, a high incidence of speech is typical of epic, as speeches increase the realism and immediacy of the (fictional) story; tellingly, the Homeric epics have been called 'dramatic' for this very reason. Especially in storm descriptions the epic poet regularly includes a lamentation speech of the hero who is at the mercy of wind and weather, thus accentuating his anguish and despair, but also his courage and strength (cf., e.g., Homer *Odyssey* 5.299–312 and Virgil *Aeneid* 1.94–101). Seneca adopts this practice, but once more further develops it by integrating not only a speech of a prominent character, in this case Ajax, even if in an inverted or, rather, perverted form, but also one of the anonymous crew (*Agamemnon* 517–526). In so doing, he encourages the audience's identification with and understanding of the sailors' experience and arouses in their mind all the emotions of dismay and disturbance that the men felt at sea, which amplifies the pathos of the scene.

⁵¹ D'Anselmi (2014: 66).

Eurybates first mentions the crew's distress at the beginning of the storm, since the pitch darkness of the night does not allow them to recognize what destroys them (*Agamemnon* 491–494). Once the vehemence of the winds wreaks havoc with the ships, their initial fear turns into panic and “gripped and stupefied by terror, [...] [they] all abandoned their duties, and let the oars slip from their hands” (*Agamemnon* 507–509: *nil ratio et usus audet: ars cessit malis; / tenet horror artus, omnis officio stupet / navita relicto, remus effugit manus*). In fact, so overwhelming is their despair that Greeks and Trojans alike, conquerors and captives, start praying to the gods (*Agamemnon* 511–512). The Greek leaders envy those who fell at Troy, from Achilles to Hector to Priam, since they either died gloriously or at least received a proper burial (*Agamemnon* 512–516). Likewise, in the ensuing speech, the crew members lament their ignoble death, which annihilates their military achievements, and attribute the storm to divine anger, even if they are unsure what they are being punished for (*Agamemnon* 517–520). However, they beseech the gods to spare them, since there are also Trojans on board of the ships (*Agamemnon* 522–526: *odia si durant tua / placetque mitti Doricum exitio genus, / quid hos simul perire nobiscum iuvat, / quibus perimus? sistite infestum mare: / vehit ista Danaos classis? et Troas vehit!*). The recollection of the Trojan War again underlines the extraordinary proportions of the storm and its destructive force, which is considered worse than any violence or brutality suffered in combat. Furthermore, the Greeks' claim that even their enemies would pity them and that the Trojans' very presence should prompt the gods to calm the raging elements highlights their utter despair and the complete reversal of fortune that has taken place. The direct rendition of their supplication makes their misery—as well as the paradox of the situation—more palpable and intensifies the emotional effect of the passage.

At the same time, the men's speech provides a sharp contrast to the bold arrogance of Ajax to whom the poet turns in the next section (*Agamemnon* 528–556), using the transition formula *ecce alia clades* (*Agamemnon* 528) in order to provoke the spectator's impulse to visualize the following events concretely. Seneca continues to conjure up the memory of the Trojan War by staging the scene like an epic battle, in which both humans and gods participate.⁵² Athena renews the storm with her father's thunderbolts (*Agamemnon* 528–532), yet Ajax is the only one not defeated by the disaster and keeps fighting against winds and waves (*Agamemnon* 532–533: *solus invictus malis / luctatur Aiax*). Even after Athena smashes his ship, he is unmoved and sails

52 Cf. Kirichenko (2013: 67). On the epic models for the scene, especially Hom. *Od.* 4.499–511, cf. Schiesaro (2014: 185–186) and Marcucci (1996: 64–65).

on like a high stony crag, eventually catching fire from the burning wreckage (*Agamemnon* 539–542: *nil ille motus, ardua ut cautes, salo / ambustus extat, dirimit insanum mare / fluctusque rumpit pectore et navem manu / complexus ignes traxit*). His insolence is fully revealed when he, having taken refuge on a rock, derides Athena for challenging an experienced warrior like him who has never retreated from any opponent and “even offers to shout mockery and defiance of Jove”⁵³ (*Agamemnon* 545–552). His boastful speech, which is an inversion or perverted variation of the conventional lamentation of the epic hero caught in a storm, is finally cut off by Neptune, who dislodges the rock and knocks him into the sea (*Agamemnon* 553–555). The intertextual echo of the first book of the *Aeneid*, in which the sea-god’s appearance leads to the calming of the storm unleashed by Juno, emphasizes Ajax’s blasphemy, as Neptune here intervenes to destroy rather than to save him like Aeneas. Moreover, the fact that Ajax’s death is orchestrated by two of the mightiest Olympian gods and involves all of nature, as the final line of the episode makes clear (*Agamemnon* 556: *terraque et igne victus et pelago iacet*), reinforces the cosmic scale of his *hybris*.⁵⁴ His impious acts, especially the rape of Cassandra at the altar of Athena in Troy, are not explicitly mentioned, but the sacrilege is undoubtedly present in the audience’s mind, since this explains why Ajax gets his very own “private” storm,⁵⁵ initiated by the goddess. By defiling both the Trojan princess and Athena’s sanctuary, Ajax violated the natural order and destabilized the universe; consequently, it takes the joint collaboration of all three elements, earth, fire and water, to eliminate him and re-establish the disrupted equilibrium.

As the above analysis has shown, Seneca’s expansion and elaboration of traditional epic features in the messenger speech of the *Agamemnon* is anything but pure rhetorical ornamentation, with which a self-indulgent author inflated and prolonged the narrative. Rather, it serves to maximize the *enargeia* of Eurybates’ account, which is transformed into an imaginary spectacle and secures the audience’s immersion in and strong affective engagement with the events related by its visual and verbal intensity. Throughout his tragic corpus, Seneca strives to evoke powerful mental images through lively pictorial description in his messenger scenes in order to increase their dramatic and emotional impact. In the following, I will give some additional examples from

53 Motto & Clark (1988: 201).

54 On the cosmic dimension of Senecan tragedy in general, cf. Schmitz (1993). The imagery here is also strongly reminiscent of the Stoic theory of *ekpyrosis*.

55 Schindler (2000: 145).

the *Hercules furens*, before turning to the cognitive implications of Seneca's ecphrastic rhetoric in conclusion.

In the *Hercules furens*, the detailed portrayal of the underworld topography forms the first part of Theseus' report about Hercules' final labor and can be regarded as a hyper-epic element in itself, since with roughly 100 lines it by far exceeds the scope of a regular *ecphrasis topou*. The description is not only longer than the narrative of Hercules' capture of Cerberus "for which it ostensibly sets the scene", but also contains several subordinate ecphraseis (cf., e.g., *Hercules furens* 709–829); moreover, the section dealing with Hercules' fight with the Stygian dog begins with a new short ecphrasis (*Hercules furens* 762–763) "to indicate where the exploit is located within the vast landscape which has been sketched in".⁵⁶ But Seneca's aim is once more not simply to demonstrate his linguistic—and intellectual—virtuosity and to rival earlier poetic treatments of the topic, especially, of course, Virgil's in *Aeneid* 6, but to create a visual tableau that makes the spectator (and reader) believe to be present at the site and experience the capacious realm of the dead first-hand.⁵⁷ This is evident from the picture Seneca draws of the entrance to the underworld and the path that leads down to the shades (*Hercules furens* 664–667, 668–679). He repeatedly highlights the spaciousness of the opening (665: *rupes alta, immenso specu*, 666: *ingens vorago, faucibus vastis*, 667: *latum iter*), which resembles the gaping mouth of a rapacious animal (664: *ora solvit*, 665: *hiat*, 666: *faucibus vastis*, 667: *pandit*) and anticipates the gigantic proportions of the subterranean world (cf. *Hercules furens* 673–774). Furthermore, he points to the eerie twilight that first illuminates the passageway, reminiscent of dusk or dawn, and gives a realistic impression of the gradually changing visibility as one moves downward (*Hercules furens* 668–672). While Aeneas and the Sibyl in Virgil make the transition to the land of the dead "in an imperceptible moment"⁵⁸—the reader sees them walking through the dark, empty kingdom of Dis immediately after the poet's invocation of the infernal powers—,⁵⁹ Seneca is keen to represent the journey as precisely as possible. He makes the audience follow the steps

56 Fitch (1987: 293). On the popularity of heroic necyiae and Hercules' labors in pantomime and its possible influence on the bipartite arrangement of Theseus' account, cf. Zanobi (2008: 245–246); cf. also Zanobi (2014: 157).

57 Cf. Kirichenko (2013: 26): "Die ekphrastische Rhetorik ist hier ... dezidiert darauf ausgerichtet, die Zuhörer nicht einfach in Zuschauer, sondern in Miterlebende zu verwandeln."

58 Austin (1977: 116).

59 Verg. *Aen.* 6.268–269: *ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbram / perque domos Ditis vacuas et inania regna*. Only the past tense of *ibant* indicates that they have left the upper world; cf. Austin (1977: 116–117).

of those “leaving the sun, the symbol of life, and descending into night, the symbol of death.”⁶⁰ Indeed, by emphasizing the permanent openness of the entrance to the underworld as well as its irresistible pull (*Hercules furens* 675–679), he transforms the spectator’s (and reader’s) experience into a kind of personal catabasis.⁶¹

The subsequent depiction of the subterranean landscape including the demonic creatures inhabiting it and the palace of the ruler, where the newly arriving shades are examined and allotted their fate (*Hercules furens* 687–697, 709–727, 731–736),⁶² is equally vivid and enables the audience to trace the road that the deceased must travel.⁶³ Seneca draws heavily on Virgil’s list of personified abstractions located in the *vestibulum Orci* (*Aeneid* 6.273–281) for his own catalog of human worries dwelling under a dark yew tree (*Hercules furens* 689–696).⁶⁴ However, he not only increases their number from seven to eleven, but also adds more color by either coupling a personification with a graphic adjective that describes the concrete effect associated with it (e.g., 690: *segnis Sopor*, “sluggish Sleep”, 693: *frendens Dolor*, “gnashing Resentment”) or portraying its characteristic activity (e.g., 692: *Pudorque serus conscios vultus tegit*, “Shame, too late, covers its guilty face”), thus heightening their visual appeal. By contrast, his description of the sterility of the underworld in a series of negative clauses is a new motif (*Hercules furens* 698–702: *non prata viridi laeta facie germinant / nec adulta leni fluctuat Zephyro seges; / non ulla ramos silva pomiferos habet: / sterilis profundi vastitas squalet soli / et foeda tellus torpet aeterno situ*). But again, by painting the realm of the dead as the complete opposite of the natural world whose features are firmly engrained in the audience’s mind, Seneca brings the gloomy wasteland before their (inner) eyes, albeit *ex negativo*, and makes them “feel the parched dryness of the region, the stagnant air, the smothering confinement of disease and death.”⁶⁵

Likewise, the extensive report of Hercules’ capture of Cerberus in the second part of Theseus’ speech serves the purpose of letting the spectator (and

60 Shelton (1978: 53).

61 Cf. Kirichenko (2013: 25).

62 On the role of Pluto in Seneca’s underworld and the specific procedure of the infernal tribunal, cf. Baertschi (2013: 101–102); cf. also Billerbeck (1999: 443) and Fitch (1987: 308).

63 Seneca does not attempt to draw a precise and coherent picture of the Erebus as a whole, but focuses on certain areas of special interest instead, like most imperial poets in their necyia scenes; cf. Baertschi (2013: 51–53). But the sustained intertextual engagement with the sixth book of the *Aeneid* keeps the Vergilian topography fresh in the audience’s mind and allows them to situate the various places and groups of residents mentioned.

64 On the Ovidian inspiration for the choice of tree, cf. Fitch (1987: 301).

65 Shelton (1978: 53); cf. also Kirichenko (2013: 26).

reader) envision the exploit with utmost clarity. The character of the passage is “markedly mimetic, concentrated as it is on fully describing at length, in [...] pictorial details combined with action-verbs, each stage of Hercules’ fight with Cerberus.”⁶⁶ The narrative consists of a succession of dynamic images, which follow one another “like consecutive photographic stills or video clips.”⁶⁷ the physical appearance of the dog and his angry reaction to Hercules’ arrival (*Hercules furens* 783–797), the struggle between the Greek hero and Cerberus (*Hercules furens* 797–804), the submission of the latter after being defeated (*Hercules furens* 807–812), and his renewed rage when confronted with the unaccustomed light of the day, necessitating Theseus’ assistance in dragging him to the upper world (*Hercules furens* 813–827). Taken together, they provide an almost film-like sequence, complete with sound effects, which recreates the exact course of events and directs the audience’s gaze, focusing alternatively on Cerberus’ and Hercules’ actions and behavior. At the same time, they arouse the viewer’s (and reader’s) emotions by having him ‘see’ from up close the frightening *furor* of the infernal watch-dog and the exceptional force—and double effort—it takes for Hercules to conquer the beast and leave victorious from the kingdom of death.

4 Seneca’s Ecphrastic Rhetoric

The preceding section has demonstrated that the hyper-epic quality of Seneca’s messenger speeches stimulates the audience’s imagination and enables them to see the action related in their mind’s eye, as if they had witnessed it themselves. Yet, the goal of Seneca’s ecphrastic narratives is not only to make the listener (and reader) feel present at and emotionally involved in the events described. On the contrary, the use of specific epic motifs in combination with vivid language and imagery also sharpens the audience’s view of the dramatic action taking place before them. By reworking well-known literary topics and, in so doing, invoking particular models, Seneca puts what is happening on stage in relation to other events and their poetic representations and facilitates the spectator’s (and reader’s) understanding of the story told. This is achieved all the more easily as the messenger is cast as an omniscient poet who gives an authoritative (and authorial) account of the incidents that have occurred. In other words: The function of Seneca’s long graphic messenger speeches is to create a foil against which to contrast the subsequent events, which invariably

66 Zanobi (2008: 250) and (2014: 161).

67 Zanobi (2008: 250).

are more shocking and terrifying than those depicted in both the poetic source text and the messenger's emulative re-enactment of it.⁶⁸ What the audience has seen as virtual eyewitnesses in the report of the *nuntius* shapes their perception of what they observe as actual spectators in the remainder of the play and allows them fully to comprehend the action shown on stage.⁶⁹ Seneca's extended messenger scenes thus are not only a fundamental component of his tragedies because they "crystallize the themes and motifs of the tragedy as a whole from yet another point of view",⁷⁰ but also an important dramatic tool (and an essential part of the author's poetics), as they support and enhance the cognitive process in which the spectator (and reader) is engaged.

In the *Agamemnon*, Eurybates' description of the sea storm that destroyed the Greek fleet on its way home from Troy is crucial to the thematic development of the play, which is a "study of revenge and expiation, of mutability in human life, and of disorder at all levels".⁷¹ As has been pointed out, the storm is portrayed as a catastrophe of cosmic dimension, imposed by the gods as a punishment for the outrages committed by the Greeks in the Trojan War. Seneca devotes considerable attention to depicting Ajax's arrogance (including his taunting of Athena in direct speech), but it is obvious that he is a paradigm for all the Greeks' atrocities at Troy, and so the massive commotion and disintegration caused by the storm must be seen as a "violent measure of atonement", by which the universe attempts to stabilize itself and "restore the disturbed harmony" (cf. the penultimate line of Eurybates' speech: *postquam litatum est Ilio, Phoebus redit; Agamemnon* 577).⁷² In fact, by shifting the focus from the Tantalid family, which dominated the first two acts, to the Greek fleet in the third, Seneca emphasizes the collective guilt of the Achaeans (as well as the severity of their crimes) and makes it clear that the storm is just the first in a long series of divine retributions meted out to them for their offenses against gods and men. The havoc created by the winds symbolizes the vicissitude and changeability of human life, especially the disastrous reversal of fortune of those in power as a result of their transgressions and the punishment (or retaliation) usually following such wrongdoing.

68 On the *maius*-motif as a general characteristic of Senecan drama, cf. Seidensticker (1985).

69 Cf. Kirichenko (2013: 11).

70 Trinacty (2014: 165).

71 Shelton (1983: 160).

72 Kugelmeier in Damschen/Heil (2013: 496); cf. also Shelton (1983: 169).

Simultaneously, the death of Ajax prefigures the end of Agamemnon, who is similarly culpable of *hybris* and impiety.⁷³ His murder is witnessed by Cassandra in the fifth act in a prophetic vision and reported in a quasi-messenger speech (*Agamemnon* 867–909). Already in the fourth act she foretells his killing “seeing Argos as a second Troy” and Agamemnon’s assassination as “both repetition of and recompense for” the Greeks’ horrific actions in the war (*Agamemnon* 727–740, 750–774).⁷⁴ The analogies between the situation at Troy and at Argos become fully evident in her account of the murder, which is presented as a re-enactment of the fall of Troy and Priam’s death at the altar of Jupiter. The vividness of the description prompts the audience’s visualization of the events taking place, as is characteristic of Seneca’s messenger scenes, and permits them to picture what is happening in their mind, from the victory banquet Agamemnon is celebrating inside the palace to his entanglement in the garment that Clytemnestra has him put on to his being slaughtered like a sacrificial bull and the dismemberment of his body (*Agamemnon* 875–880, 881–896, 897–903, 904–909). The parallelization of Agamemnon’s murder with the destruction of Troy and the killing of Priam, respectively—Cassandra explicitly compares the feast held at Argos with that of the Trojans on the last night (*Agamemnon* 875–877)—resumes the theme of crime and expiation prominent in Eurybates’ speech and throughout the play. The presence of Trojan spoils including Priam’s embroidered robe which Agamemnon is wearing is a blatant reminder of the brutal devastation of the city and the cruelty of the Greek soldiers, for which Agamemnon as the leader of the expedition must assume major responsibility. Consequently, Cassandra sees his demise as being tantamount to a Trojan victory (*Agamemnon* 869–871), which surpasses that of their conquerors, the Greeks, as it is achieved in one day as opposed to ten years (*Agamemnon* 867: *res agitur intus magna, par annis decem*).

That said, the staging of Ajax’s death as an epic battle also highlights the indignity and shamefulness of Agamemnon’s murder. While Ajax is granted one final moment of glory, even if this showcases once again his insolence and disrespect, Agamemnon dies ignominiously at the hands of his treacherous wife and her cowardly lover. When confronted with the violence of the storm,

73 This has first been stressed by Seidensticker (1969: 128, n. 157); cf. also Lefèvre (1973: 82) and Kugelmeier in Damschen/Heil (2013: 496).

74 Fitch (2004: 121). On the parallels between Troy and Argos/Mycene in the *Agamemnon*, cf. Schiesaro (2014) and Lohikoski (1966); cf. also Boyle (1985: 1312–1320) on the theme of history’s cyclicity in this and other plays. On the incorporation of intertexts from Horace as well as Vergil in Cassandra’s vision, cf. Trinacty (2014: 199–210).

Agamemnon envies Priam, since he was buried in his own land (*Agamemnon* 514); yet, it turns out that for the victor of Troy “there awaits the most humiliating of deaths, and he will find that his ancestral home is more dangerous than war or the sea.”⁷⁵ Agamemnon manages to survive the turmoil of the winds, but he cannot escape the tempest that rages in his house. Eurybates’ narrative of the Greek fleet’s annihilation therefore not only adds an important viewpoint to the plurality of voices in the drama reflecting on human transgression, retribution, disorder, and the fall from fortune, but also draws the spectator’s (and reader’s) attention to the utter dishonor of Agamemnon’s death. If the audience felt the wrath of the weather and shared the Greeks’ despair thanks to the *enargeia* of Eurybates’ report, they now realize that the horror experienced pales in comparison with the barbaric killing of Agamemnon.⁷⁶ In contrast to Ajax he does not have a chance to fight heroically, but is entrapped like a wild animal and executed in a perverted sacrifice, thus becoming a perfect double of Priam.⁷⁷ Seneca’s reworking of the traditional epic storm description makes the audience recognize that the culmination of the stage action, the murder of the play’s eponymous hero, outdoes the apocalyptic scenario Eurybates had delineated (as well as the literary models it emulates) and enables them fully to appreciate the tragedy of Agamemnon’s fate. The ecphrastic rhetoric of the messenger speech advances the understanding of the play and secures its dramatic and emotional effect.

This shows that the epic character and visual exuberance of Seneca’s messenger speeches are an important aspect of his tragic poetics. Unlike Brecht’s epic theater, which uses *Verfremdung* (alienation) to force the audience to react critically and dispassionately to the events on stage and to think about the economic, political, and socio-cultural circumstances governing their own lives, Senecan drama seeks to engage several mental faculties, most notably the imagination and (literary) memory, in order to foster the possibility of recognition and learning. The tragedies combine visual, imaginative, and cognitive appeal to constitute an aesthetic experience that allows the audience

75 Shelton (1983: 173).

76 Cf. Kirichenko (2013: 68–69): “Im *Agamemnon* stellt sich heraus, dass der Tod, den der Protagonist nach seiner Ankunft... erleidet, die in der Beschreibung des Seesturms gezeichneten Schreckensbilder übertrifft. Mehr noch: Da der Seesturm aus Agamemnons Perspektive als ein schmerzhafteres Ereignis beschrieben wird als der würdelose, heimtückische Mord an Priamus, haben wir es hier offensichtlich mit einer doppelten Überbietung zu tun: Das, was wir nun sehen, stellt gewissermaßen den Mord an Priamus in dritter Potenz dar.”

77 Cf. Kirichenko (2013: 73–74).

emotionally to connect with the action represented and simultaneously reflect on it. Aware of the hermeneutic potential of a shift in theatrical communication and the change of perspective this entails, Seneca deliberately incorporates epic elements in order to afford the audience an additional—and essential—point of view, while at the same time evoking their empathy with the characters or situation portrayed. In so doing, he facilitates the spectator's (and reader's) apprehension of the significance of the tragic events before him as well as the play's overall message. Conceived in this way, Seneca's tragedies can be seen as part of his broader philosophical-pedagogical project, not because they represent Stoic doctrine and serve a specific didactic purpose, again in contrast to Brecht's *Lehrtheater* (theater of instruction), but because they mesh sensory and intellectual stimulation and involve emotion and reason, as is necessary for any process of cognitive realization.⁷⁸ The hybrid mixture of narrative and dramatic in Senecan tragedy thus is "one of its great strengths, since at each juncture between different modes and different focalisations the audience are freshly re-engaged in the struggle to discover meaning".⁷⁹

78 Cf. Wessels (2014: 159–160).

79 Goward (1999: 11).

The Reception of Latin Archaic Tragedy in Ovid's Elegy

Marco Filippi

Omne genus scripti gravitate tragoedia vincit:
haec quoque materiam semper amoris habet.

(OVID TRISTIA 2.381–382)

The death of Accius († c. 86 BC), the last great leading figure of the so-called “Republican tragic triad”, ends a literary age, the one of tragedians meant as professional figures, and starts a gradual process of ennoblement of dramatic genre, characterized by amateur essays by famous representatives of society which are not anymore the object of scenic productions and thus do not have great diffusion among the general public.¹ Such a process must be justified by a progressive changing not only in public taste, increasingly oriented towards more trivial forms of popular entertainments like gladiatorial games, mimes and pantomimes, but also in the idea of performance: tragic composition starts to be conceived as a sort of literary *divertissement* and closet drama replaces scenic performance privileging the use, more and more evident, of forms of rhetoric and gestural art intended for small halls (*auditoria*) or private homes.

We must not consider, however, that tragic theater, even though by now encoded in its new “literary look”, has lost, together with a lot of its past audience, the ability to be interesting and fascinating as it had been at its acme. Nevertheless, many years after Accius’ death, the plays of the “tragic triad” continued to be performed at the state-sponsored *ludi scaenici*² in larger and more

1 On the ennoblement of the tragic genre, cf. Beare (1955: 115–17), Beacham (1991: 125–27), Goldberg (1996: 270), Boyle (2006: 143), and Curley (2013: 31–32).

2 In ancient Rome *ludi scaenici* were theatrical performances associated with the celebration of public games. It was at *ludi Romani* in 240 BC that Livius Andronicus produced the first translation of a Greek tragedy. The Romans of Classical period considered this event the beginning of their national theatre. Accordingly, at the time of Plautus and Terentius there were four yearly recurrences for the representation of *ludi scaenici*: *ludi Romani* (on September), *ludi Megalenses* (in honor of *Magna Mater*, on April), *ludi Apollinares* (on July) and *ludi Plebei*, dedicated to Jupiter (on August). *Ludi scaenici* were managed by magistrates, aediles, or urban praetors. During the festival there were not only dramatic performances but also competitive entertainments and gladiatorial combats because the electorate had to be entertained. The public and civic nature of theatrical festivals promoted by magistrates

magnificent theaters of permanent construction,³ and some tragic events had become so much a part of the common memory that Cicero does not have to quote his source precisely,⁴ a clear sign that tragedy was being appropriated into different contexts, largely political.⁵ During the transition from Republic to Principate tragic theatrical reminiscences are individuated with certainty both in Virgil⁶ and in Horace, notwithstanding the judgments expressed by the latter on archaic Latin tragedians.⁷

It is within this historic-literary framework of reminiscence and appropriation of Republican tragic theater by leading Augustan writers that we must try to contextualize the possibility of a lively relationship between Latin elegiac poetry and archaic Latin tragedy. Such an investigation is impeded by two unavoidable problems: first, the fragmentary nature of archaic Latin tragedy, which makes it difficult, if not impossible, to determine the context (and often the text) of the plays, restricts any claim to the level of hypothesis. Second, and even more severe, by its nature, elegiac poetry was an “open” genre *par excellence* or, rather, a “merging of several literary genres”⁸ characterized by a refined use of *variatio*. By this I mean its sources are re-elaborated or purposely contaminated, becoming at times unrecognizable, using a form of “reduced” poetry, as tribute to the main rules of Alexandrianism, which inhibits modern scholarship, problematizing analysis of the content and of its eventual

is clear in the selection of the subjects in the tragedies of historical theme; for instance, celebration of famous ancestors or heroic deeds of some clans and, in *praetexta*, references to influential politicians.

- 3 Re-performances of Republican dramas on stage were available down to triumph of Augustus. The first permanent theatre at Rome was the Theatre of Pompey, which was built in 55 BC. Other temporary stages, as that of Scaurus, were too expensive because of their decoration. Consider, for example, ostentatious performances of Accius' *Clytaemestra* and of an *Equos Troianus* (Naevius' one?) as cited in Cic. *Fam.* 7.1.2.
- 4 Cf. the opening speech in Pacuvius' *Iliona* (Cic. *Tusc.* 1.106) or the famous friendship scene between Orestes and Pylades contained probably in Pacuvius' *Chryses* (Cic. *Lael.* 24), not to mention the opening of Ennius' *Andromacha aechmalotis* and *Medea exul* or *oderint dum metuant* in Accius' *Atreus* (Cic. *Off.* 1.97 et al.).
- 5 Cf. Accius' *Brutus: Tullius, qui libertatem civibus stabiliverat* (R³ *praetext.* 40 in Cic. *Sest.* 123) and *adesp. TrRF* 1 15 *nostra miseria tu es Magnus*... (Cic. *Att.* 2.19.3).
- 6 On the influence of Latin archaic tragedy on Virgil, cf. Stabryla (1970), Wigodsky (1972), Zorzetti (1990: 245–47) and Hardie (1997: 312–26), with further bibliography.
- 7 On the connection between Horace and the Latin archaic tragedians cf., besides Brink's commentaries to the epistle to Augustus and to the *Ars Poetica*, La Penna (1963: 148–62), Ronconi (1979: 501–24), Aricò (1983: 67–93 and 1998: 73–90).
- 8 Cf. Spoth (1992: 221). For the merging of genres, Kroll (1924: 202–24) is essential even now; cf. also Conte (1991: 53–94).

connections with works of other literary genres. Moreover, the frequent resort to the technique of the *arte allusiva*, by which the elegiac poet presumes in his reader a certain level of *doctrina* (that is, a deep knowledge of myth and of its numerous retellings in multiple genres as well as the ability to detect from a single narration or even from a phrase the references dealing with it), does not help the modern reader who cannot have, obviously, the amount of learning (*doctrina*) poets assumed of their ancient audience; scholars instead have to confront themselves in this specific case with the almost total wreck of tragic theater, whose allusions and nuanced additions would have been absorbed by the elegiac poets but cannot be known to us.

Notwithstanding the difficulties mentioned above, I think that we can still identify, even though there are scarce remains at our disposal, the reception of Latin archaic tragedy in elegy, particularly in Ovid.⁹ In his *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* Dryden writes:¹⁰

He of them who had a genius most proper for the stage was Ovid; he had a way of writing so fit to stir up a pleasing admiration and concernment, which are the objects of a tragedy, and to show the various movements of a soul combating betwixt two different passions, that, had he lived in our age, or in his own could have writ with our advantages, no man but must have yielded to him.

The entirety of Ovid's poetic career is permeated with tragic spirit.¹¹ His dedication to tragedy is already clearly expressed in *Amores* 3.1 where the poet introduces the personifications of Elegy and Tragedy, both willing to claim their superiority and their space in Ovidian work. He closes this poem (67–70):

*'exiguum vati concede, Tragoedia, tempus:
tu labor aeternus; quod petit illa [scil. Elegia] breve est'.
Mota dedit veniam. Teneri properentur Amores,
dum vacat: a tergo grandius urguet opus.*

70

9 In the future I intend to examine the relationship between Latin archaic tragedy and Propertian elegy. Tibullus' elegies, because of their more intimistic and contemplative and less dramatic nature, seem to offer, at least at a first glance, less occasions of interest for this research.

10 Wilkinson (1955: 226).

11 On Ovid's career, cf. Mariotti (2000: 123–53).

“Indulge thy bard a short space, O Tragedy!
 A labour eternal art thou; what she asks is but brief”.
 She was moved, and granted my prayer—let the tender Loves come
 hasting,
 while I am free; close after me presses a greater task!

In *Amores* 3.15, then, Ovid bids a long goodbye to love elegy and announces that Bacchus, the god of tragedy, has called him to a higher genre (1–2 and 15–20):

*quaere novum vatem, tenerorum mater Amorum:
 raditur haec elegis ultima meta meis.*

Seek a new bard, mother of tender Loves!
 I am come to the last turning-post my elegies will graze.

*culte puer puerique parens Amathusia culti,
 aurea de campo vellite signa meo;
 corniger increpuit thyrsos graviores Lyaeus:
 pulsanda est magnis area maior equis.
 Inbelles elegi, genialis Musa, valete,
 post mea mansurum fata superstes opus.*

20

O worshipful child, and thou of Amathus, mother of the worshipful child,
 pluck ye up from my field your golden standards!
 The horned Lyaeus hath dealt me a sounding blow with weightier
 thyrsus;
 I must smite the earth with mighty steeds on a mightier course.
 Unwarlike elegies, congenial Muse, O fare ye well,
 work to live on when I am no more!

Ovid declares that he will create love elegies for a short time, but then will dedicate himself entirely to tragedy, which will be his occupation for the rest of his life. This compromise apparently was not respected and Ovid in all his life wrote only one tragedy, *Medea*,¹² after which he returned to the elegiac

12 Ovid's *Medea*, very appreciated in ancient times, is lost. Approbation comes from two stringent critics: Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.98 and [Tac.] *Dial.* 12.6. Two fragments of Ovid's *Medea* survive; on the possibility of a third fragment in Sen. *Dial.* 3.1.4, cf. Faider (1922: 131–33). Cf.

couplet and temporarily to the epic hexameter of *Metamorphoses*. The presence of tragedy, however, and particularly *Medea* (below 203–210), is everywhere in Ovid's lyric poetry, through mythological tales and *exempla*, although with different aims in different works and at different times.

In the *Amores* we detect some tragic echoes which certify a deep knowledge of Latin archaic tragedy, at least at a formal level, such as Ovid *Amores* 1.3.11 *vitisque repertor*, which probably borrows from Ennius *TrRF II* 42.2 (*Athamas*) *Lyaeus vitis inventor sacrae* and Accius' *Bacchae Dionyse.../...vitisator* (240/242 R³), and Ovid *Amores* 2.2.10 *quem metuūt quisque, perisse cupit*, which is derivated from Ennius *inc. TrRF II* 163 *quem metuunt oderunt; quem quisque odit perisse expetit*.¹³ Later, in *Ars amatoria*, the poet uses tragic *exempla* to give advice, e.g., to ladies on how to primp, such as to dress in white if they are brownish as *Andromeda*,¹⁴ and in dark dresses if they are white as *Briseis*,¹⁵ and to men on how to court them, and in *Remedia amoris*, to the contrary, on how men and women may get rid of love, telling them that, if they will follow his advice, they will not end as *Laodamia* or other people who suffered for

also, about Ovid's *Medea*, the recent book of Gatti (2014). The idea that Ovid wrote more tragedies goes back at least to Masson (1708: 118–20) and has to be put aside.

- 13 I wish to furnish some other examples, well-aware that a treatise on the comparisons between the elegies and the tragic fragments would deserve larger space: Ov. *Am.* 3.2.66 *quadriugos aequo carcere misit equos* ~ Enn. *TrRF II* 23.2 (*Andromacha aechmalotis*) *Hectorem curru quadriugo raptarier* (cf. also Verg. *Georg.* 3.18; *Aen.* 12.162) and especially Ov. *Am.* 2.11, the *propempticon* to *Corinna*, in which Ovid expresses his unhappiness about the sea travel of his *domina* with the nurse language of Ennian *Medea exul*, who however complained about a very different kind of departure: *Am.* 2.11.1–2 *prima malas docuit mirantibus aequoris undis / Peliaco pinus vertice caesa vias* ~ Enn. *TrRF II* 89.1–2 (*Medea exul*) *utinam ne in nemore Pelio securibus / caesa accidisset abiegnata ad terram trabes* (cf. also Cat. 64.1 and Prop. 3.22.11–14); 2.11.4 *conspiciam fulvo vellere vexit ovem* ~ Enn. *TrRF II* 89.6 (*Medea exul*) *pellem inauratam arietis* (cf. also Ov. *Her.* 6.49; 12.201); 2.11.5 *o utinam, ne quis...* ~ Enn. *TrRF II* 89.1 (*Medea exul*) *utinam ne in nemore Pelio*. A comparison not only on a formal level but also on the conceptual one could be established at last between Ov. *Am.* 3.3.1 *esse deos, i, crede: fidem iurata fefellit* and Accius' *Antigona: iam iam neque di regunt / neque profecto deum supremus rex <iam> curat hominibus* (142–143 R³) on the mistrust of gods existence and of their intervention on human matters (cf. also Sen. *Med.* 1026–1027).
- 14 Ov. *Ars* 3.191–192 *Alba decent fuscas; albis, Cephei, placebas; / sic tibi vestitae pressa Seriphos erat*.
- 15 Ov. *Ars* 3.189–190 *Pulla decent niveas: Briseida pulla decebant; / cum rapta est, pulla tum quoque veste fuit*.

love.¹⁶ In *Tristia* and, to a lesser extent, in *Epistulae ex Ponto* recourse to tragic *exempla* is more mature and personal, as it must reflect his mood in exile, and the poet often draws a comparison with Philoctetes banished or (again) with Medea abandoned.¹⁷ In the long epistle *Tristia* 2, in hopes of eliciting the emperor's pity, Ovid reminds his reader that a poet's work does not necessarily correspond to his personal behavior (otherwise Accius would be *atrox*)¹⁸ and that many authors have written about love but have not shared his misfortune.¹⁹

It is in *Tristia* 2 where finally, through a list of Greek and Latin writers culminating his defence,²⁰ Ovid expresses clearly his vision of literature *sub species amoris* and declares that tragedy, too, which is the most serious literary genre, is concerned with love and, above all, exists as a consequence of love: *omne genus scripti gravitate tragoedia vincit: / haec quoque materiam semper amoris habet* (Every kind of writing is surpassed in seriousness by tragedy, but this also constantly deals with the theme of love; 2.381–382). This couplet is followed by a long series of mythic *exempla* in quick succession: one verse alone can contain three different myths (cf. *Tristia* 2.401; 403), all of which reconfirms Ovid's vast knowledge of Latin archaic tragedy. More importantly, it reveals the Ovidian re-reading of tragic myths in an elegiac tone and helps define to what extent this re-reading is present in his work. Actually, although this vision is announced for the first time in these verses and apparently only as justification for Augustus, it is a deeply rooted feature of the Ovidian spirit at least as far back as the *Heroides*.²¹

16 Ov. *Rem.* 723–724 *Si potes, et ceras remove: quid imagine muta / carperis? Hoc perit Laodamia modo.*

17 Cf. e.g. Ov. *Tr.* 2.387–388; 3.9; 5.1.61–62; 5.4.12; *Pont.* 3.1.54.

18 Ov. *Tr.* 2.359 *Accius esset atrox, conviva Terentius esset.*

19 Cf. Ov. *Tr.* 2.353–356; 359. In the present overview, I am omitting the *Metamorphoses* because it is written in epic hexameters, even though the poem often reflects on love affairs. Also *Fasti* is absent as it does not concern itself principally with romance, even though it is written in elegiac couplets.

20 Greek writers: Anacreon (*Tr.* 2.363–364), Sappho (365–366), Callimachus (367–368), Menander (369–370), Homer (371–380), Euripides (383 at least), Aristides (413–414), Eubius (415–416). Latin writers: Ennius (423–424), Lucretius (425–426), Catullus (427–430), Calvus (431–432), Tigidas and Memmius (433–434), Cinna and Anser (435), Cornificius and Valerius Cato (436), Varro Atacinus (439–440), Hortensius and Servius Sulpicius (441–442), Sisenna (443–444), Cornelius Gallus (445–446), Tibullus (447–464) and Propertius (465–466).

21 On this point, cf., esp., Scivoletto (1976: 90): *Badate, pare voglia avvertire il poeta, anche se i personaggi delle Heroides sono personaggi mitici, propri da tragedia o da poema epico, il fondo è sempre l'esperienza amorosa.*

The poetic form of the *Heroides* is surely an Ovidian innovation. There is, however, considerable debate on whether Ovid gives more emphasis to the verbal aspect²² or to the visual one.²³ It is not necessary to choose between these two views: the elegiac genre, because of its inherent multiformity (due to Ovidian experimentalism), deserves the title of ‘supergenre’.²⁴ This contribution will draw attention to the composite nature of this new literary form, in which contributions from rhetoric, such as, especially, *ethopoeiae* and *suasoriae*, walk hand-in-hand with predisposition to performability.²⁵ We speak about a “new literary form”, but we should at least recall Propertius’ perhaps earlier elegy 4.3, a literary epistle from a woman (Arethusa) in love to her husband (Licota) involved in an Oriental war. Even so, it is incontestable that Ovid’s *Heroides* represent a significant landmark in the gradual process of interest changing from a heroic dimension to a more intimate one (and, thus, simultaneously, from theaters to private halls), descriptive on the whole of the new literature of the Augustan Age.²⁶ In this transition, characterized by an insertion of the erotic element into the tragic one, Ovid seems not to have ignored the authors of Greek and Latin tragedies. The balance of my contribution focuses on two examples of the reuse, by the elegiac poet, of texts and contexts of Latin archaic tragedy.

22 Cf. Oppel (1968: 35–81: poetic *suasoriae*); Kennedy (2002: 219: monologues in the form of epistles). Cf., also, Auhagen (1999: 12, 45–53 and 2007: 416–18), who follows Kennedy’s opinion.

23 Cf. Friedlaender (1920: 127–29: recitals of love scenes danced onstage); Cunningham (1949: 100–106: love elegies performed or danced as pantomimes); Sargent (1996: libretti for pantomimes). More vague and embraceable, in my opinion, is the judgment, among others, of Fränkel (1945: 45; 190: monologues and tragic arias) and Wilkinson (1955: 86: tragic soliloquies).

24 Cf. Harrison (2002: 79).

25 Cf. Jouteur (2009: 5) in a volume of studies on various aspects of the theatricality in Ovid, and Curley (2013: 59–61).

26 Consider, for example, the epic poem of Pompeius Macrus, Ovid’s friend, which included the love stories of Paris and Helen and of Protesilaus and Laodamia (cf. *Ov. Am.* 2.18). In a theatrical context, the hypothesis of Aricò (1998: 409) is significant, according to whom the *Tecmessa* of Julius Caesar Strabo could represent an example of the interest shift. Could it be that also Pupius’ *lacrimosa poemata* mentioned by Hor. *Epist.* 1.1.67, of which unfortunately nothing is known, is an indicator of interest shift?

1 Ovid. *Heroides* 12 (Medea to Jason)

In a discussion on the connections between Ovid's elegiac poetry and Latin archaic tragedy an examination of the character of Medea is compulsory. Medea seems to be the character from myth who most intrigued Ovid, and he had such an interest in her vicissitudes that he leaves the impression of wishing to treat all aspects of her myth.²⁷ In the letter she writes to Jason, Medea is initially represented as a young girl in love, not yet banished from Corinth. Although she already has knowledge of her lover's intentions, she evokes memories in elegiac tones based on Apollonian epic models. Gradually, though, in a sort of ascending climax, the elegiac *puella* is over-shadowed by the dramatic heroine, angered and eager to react, inviting the reader to foresee the tragic end (cf., for example, 12.21 *est aliqua ingrato meritum exprobrare voluptas*; 180–182 *flebit et ardores vincet adusta meos! / Dum ferrum flammaeque aderunt sucusque veneni, / hostis Medae nullus inultus erit*, 207–209; 212).²⁸ The re-reading of the tragic character inside the elegiac point of view, which is an Ovidian innovation, is not therefore equivalent to the total annihilation of the tragic identity of the character itself.

In the course of this transition from the tones of *genus tenue* to those of *genus grande*, in the tension between the two *genera*, there are numerous echoes of Latin archaic tragedy.²⁹ *Heroides* 12.7–10 is illustrative of Ovid's working method:³⁰

27 Cf., besides the tragedy *Medea* and *Her. 12*, *Her. 6* (in opposition to the character of Hypsipyle); cf., also, *Ars* 1.336; 2.103; 381–382; 3.33–34; *Met.* 7.1–424.

28 Medea's double nature has convinced some scholars to presume a division of the epistle in two sections, one "Apollonian" (1–130) and one "Euripidean" (131–214). Actually, quite a neat distinction between the two parts cannot be accepted, due to the undeniable presence of Euripidean elements in the so-called "Apollonian" section and *vice versa*.

29 The main sources of *Her. 12* are Euripides' *Medea* and Apollonius of Rhodes' *Argonautica*. Other scholars do not exclude influences from Sophocles' *Sorcerers*, from Varro Atacinus' *Argonautae*, and Ovid's *Medea*. On possible influence of Ovid's *Medea*, see, among others, Leo (1878: 169). Hinds (1993: 35) remains unconvinced. For art and archaeological *comparanda*, such the painting of Medea by Timomachus of Byzantium consecrated by Caesar in the temple of *Venus Genetrix* (cf. *Ov. Tr.* 2.525–528; *Plin. Nat.* 35.26; 35.136; 35.145), cf. Heinze (1997: 10).

30 Comparison between Ovid. *Her. 12*.7–10 and the prologue of the Ennian *Medea exul* has been already made from as long ago as Johannes Baptista Egnatius (1727: 156). This prologue was generally known to ancients, as it is confirmed by the number of its citations, at least thirteen and in several different genres. On the relation between Ennius and the beginning of Cat. 64 see, besides Catullan commentaries, at least Traina (1986: 131–58), Arkins (1982: 129), Zetzel (1983: 256–57) and Thomas (1999: 12–24 and 30–31). In addition

*ei mihi! Cur umquam iuvenalibus acta lacertis
Phrixeam petiit Pelias arbor ovem?
 Cur umquam Colchi Magnetida vidimus Argon,
 turbaque Phasiacam Graia bibistis aquam?* 10

Ah me! Why was the ship from the forests of Pelion ever driven
 over the seas by strong young arms in quest of the ram of Phrixus?
 Why did we Colchians ever cast eye upon Magnesian Argo,
 and why did your Greek crew ever drink of the waters of the Phasis?

Ennius' *Medea exul* (TrRF II 89.1–7) is the obvious source:

*utinam ne in nemore Pelio securibus
 caesa accidisset abiegna ad terram trabes,
 neve inde navis inchoandi exordium
 coepisset, quae nunc nominatur nomine
Argo, quia Argivi in ea delecti viri* 5
*vecti petebant pellem inauratam arietis
 Colchis imperio regis Peliae per dolum.*

Would that the firwood timber had not fallen
 to earth hewn by axes in a Pelian grove;
 and that thereupon no prelude had been made to begin
 the ship which is now known by the name of Argo,
 for that chosen Argive heroes were carried in it when they were seeking
 the golden fleece of the ram from the Colchians,
 by trickery, at the behest of King Pelias.

The introduction of Ovid's epistle is the part of the poem in which the presence of tragedy, here Ennius' *Medea exul*, is most felt.³¹ But in Ovid, differing from Ennius (and Euripides), the words are not said by the nurse but by Medea

to the two passages by Ennius and Ovid mentioned, there is Phaedr. 4.7, already noticed by Burman (1727: 156) and recently reexamined by Pellucchi (2008: 233–34; 237–38; 241 and 246).

31 Eur. *Med.* 1–8; cf. also Ap. Rh. 4.33; Cat. 64.1–7; 171–177; Verg. *Aen.* 4.657 (which depends on it); *Ecl.* 4.34–35; Hor. *Epo.* 16.57–58; Prop. 3.22.12; Ov. *Am.* 2.11.1–6. *Her.* 1.5–6 is especially appropriate: *o utinam* tum, cum Lacedaemona classe petebat, / obrutus insanis esset adulter aquis!.

herself, who wishes the Argo had never arrived in Colchis.³² Beyond the comparison in how Ovid's opening is dramatically charged, the language and syntax show evident tragic *color*, such as in the interjection *ei mihi!* in line 7 and the series of rhetorical questions. Landolfi is incisive in seeing that the point of the letter as positioned by Ovid is to render visual an attempt by Medea to take back her lover.³³ Other borrowings from Ennius, rather than Euripides, are equally cogent: *et premitis pictos, corpora Graia, toros* (*Heroides* 12.30) and *qui peterent natis secum tua corpora telis* (*Heroides* 12.47) would seem to draw their inspiration from *antiqua erilis fida custos corporis* (*TrRF* II 96.1) and *salvete, optima corpora* (*TrRF* II 97.1).³⁴ The periphrastic use of *corpus* in the meaning of *persona* is archaic³⁵ and it occurs elsewhere in Ovid such as at *Heroides* 3.36 and 17.119.

Once more Ovid innovates while keeping his models obvious for his informed reader: Ovid *Heroides* 12.57 *ut positum tetigi thalamo male saucia lectum* is probably borrowed from Ennius *TrRF* II 89.9 (*Medea exul*) *Medea, animo aegro, amore saevo saucia*.³⁶ Medea's dream is not narrated in the third person, but the protagonist herself in the first person revokes a night of wakefulness; the dramatic heroine is more and more substituting for the *simplex puella*.

In *Heroides* 12.75–76 *perdere posse sat est, siquem iuvat ipsa potestas; / sed tibi servatus gloria maior ero* (to have power to ruin is enough, if anyone delight in power for itself; but to save me will be greater glory), which shows its Ennian pedigree (*tu me amoris magis quam honoris serva<vi>sti gratia*, *TrRF* II 92),³⁷ Medea throws back at Jason the words he used when asking for help to reach the Golden Fleece. The fact that these verses seem to be a changed recall of

32 On the evolution of the subject cf., e.g., Hross (1958: 43).

33 For a detailed analysis of this passage, as also *nescio quid certe mens mea malus agit* (*Her.* 12.212), the reader is directed to Landolfi (1998: 62): 'La protasi della lettera si presenta... come un accurato lavoro ad incastro i cui singoli tasselli, pur derivando da fonti facilmente riconoscibili, via via si rivelano funzionali non già ad una violenta rampogna *de visu*, bensì ad un estremo tentativo di riconquista del partner'.

34 Cf. also Naev. *TrRF* I 34.1–2 (*Lycurgus*) *vos qui regalis corporis custodias / agitis*...

35 Cf. *TLL* IV.1015:37–1017:57.

36 Cf. also Cat. 64.250; Lucr. 4.1048; Pompon. *Atell.* 18 R.3; Verg. *Aen.* 4.1; *poeta incertus ap.* Gell. 19.11.5; Apul. *Met.* 4.32; Oros. *Hist.* 1.12.10.

37 Cf. also Pacuvius' *Armorum iudicium*:... *men servasse, ut essent qui me perderent!* (R³ 40). The comparison between the Ovidian passage and the Pacuvian one has already been discussed by Burman (1759: 149). *Medea* fr. 1, too, has language similar to this passage (*servare potui, perdere an possim rogas?*) and a further echo can be pointed out in *Met.* 7.56 and 93–94.

Medea fr. 1 is in my opinion a proof in favor of the authenticity of the epistle, if we consider the Ovidian bent for self-quotation.³⁸

The passage continues *per genus et numen cuncta videntis avi, / per triplicis vultus arcanaque sacra Dianae* (I pray, by thy line, and by the godhead of thy allseeing grandsire the sun, by the three-fold face and holy mysteries of Diana, *Heroides* 12.78–79), which looks back to Ennius, *TrRF II* 95.1–2: *Iuppiter tuque adeo summe Sol qui omnis res inspicis / quique lumine tuo mare terram caelum contines* (O Jupiter, thou rather, Sun most high, / who lookest upon all things, and pervadest / sea land and sky with thy light).³⁹ Jason's apostrophe to the gods would have been recognized as a common tragic.

Heroides 12.113–116 deserves fuller quotation:

at non te fugiens sine me, germane, reliqui!
Deficit hoc uno littera nostra loco.
Quod facere ausa mea est, non audet scribere dextra; 115
sic ego, sed tecum, dilaceranda fui.

But thee, o my brother, I did not leave behind as I fled!
 In this one place my pen fails.
 Of the deed my right hand was bold enough to do, it is not bold enough to write.
 So I, too, should have been torn limb from limb—but with thee!

Ovidian self-reference is apparent here also as the words echo *Heroides* 6 written to Jason by Hypsipyle, queen of Lemnos, another woman he abandoned. Lines 129–30 by Hypsipyle are about Medea (*spargere quae fratris potuit lacerata per agros / corpora, pignoribus parceret illa meis?*) and take Ennius' *Alexander* as their point of departure (*cum tuo lacerato corpore*, *TrRF II* 21.2). It is a theme to which Ovid returned such as in *Tristia* 3.9.25–34:

protinus ignari nec quicquam tale timentis 25
innocuum rigido perforat ense latus,
atque ita divellit divulsaque membra per agros
dissipat in multis invenienda locis

38 The authenticity of *Her.* 12 was first challenged by Scaliger and later but in less categorical way by Lachmann (1876: 56–61); cf. also Knox (1986: 214). The case for authenticity is made persuasively by Heinze (1991–1993: 94–97). Cf. also Bessone (1997: 18–19 with n. 17).

39 Cf. also Hom. *Od.* 12.323; Aesch. *Pr.* 91; fr. 192.5 Radt (*Prometheus Unbound*); Ch. 985–986; Soph. fr. 535 Radt (*Sorcerers*); o.c. 869; Eur. *Med.* 1251; Ap. Rh. 3.985–986; Verg. *Aen.* 4.511; 607–610; 6.247; Hor. *Odes* 3.22.4.

(*neu pater ignoret, scopulo proponit in alto
pallentesque manus sanguineumque caput*), 30
*ut genitor luctuque novo tardetur et, artus
dum legat extinctos, triste moretur iter.*
*Inde Tomis dictus locus hic, quia fertur in illo
membra soror fratris consecuisse sui*

Forthwith while he in his ignorance feared
no such attack she pierced his innocent side with the hard sword.
Then she tore him limb from limb, scattering the fragments
of his body throughout the fields so that they must be sought in many
places.

And to apprise her father she placed upon a lofty rock
the pale hands and gory head.
Thus was the sire delayed by his fresh grief, lingering,
while he gathered those lifeless limbs, on a journey of sorrow.
So was this place called Tomis because here, they say,
the sister cut to pieces her brother's body.

The sentiments are not antithetical to *Ibis* 435–36, an invective written by Ovid also during his exile: *et tua sic latos spargantur membra per agros, / tamquam quae patrias detinuere vias*. Tragic inspiration seems apparent in *adesp. TrRF* I 74, attributed to Ennius' *Medea exul* or perhaps to Accius' *Medea sive Argonautae*.⁴⁰

*postquam pater
adpropinquat iamque paene ut comprehendatur parat,
puerum interea obtruncat membraque articulatim dividit
perque agros passim dispergit corpus; id ea gratia
ut, dum nati dissipatos artus captaret parens,
ipsa interea effugeret, illum ut maeror tardaret sequi,
sibi salutem ut familiari pareret parricidio.*

After her father
drew near and was nigh already preparing to have her seized,
she meanwhile slaughtered his boy and carved his limbs joint by joint,
and strewed the carcass far and wide over the fields: and this she did

40 Cf. also Verg. *Georg.* 4.522 *discerptum latos iuvenem* (scil. *Orpheum*) *sparsere per agros*; Phaedr. 4.7.15; Manil. 3.9–10; Sen. *Med.* 133–134; 452–453; 630–631; Lucan. 10.464–467; Petron. 108.14; Apul. *Met.* 7.26.1; 7.26.3; 7.27.1 (in the form of a parody).

so that, while the child's father was grasping at his son's scattered limbs, she herself meanwhile might escape, and grief might delay him from pursuit,
and she might conceive a plan to save herself by this vile manslaughter of her own kin.

In a connection of reminiscences it is usually possible to determine with certainty Ovid's dependence on a fragment of an uncertain author probably belonging to a Republican tragedy about Medea.⁴¹ In this particular instance, both Ovid and the unknown author diverge from Apollonian version of the story in which Medea betrays her brother, Absyrtus, but she does not kill him herself but leaves Jason to do it.⁴² They follow Euripides, who presents Medea as a murderer (Euripides *Medea* 167; 1334) with the intention of placing the main character under the fatal light of tragedy.⁴³

Ovid *Heroides* 12.171 (*quae me non possum, potui sopire draconem*) and *Heroides* 6.11 (*seminibus iactis segetes adolesse virorum*) also look back to *TrRF* 1 *adespota* 136 (*non commemoro, quod draconis saevi sopivi impetum, / non quod domui vim taurorum et segetis armatae manus*)⁴⁴ and ultimately to Euripides

41 The passage attribution is controversial. Ribbeck (1875: 534–35) believes it belongs to *Medea sive Argonautae* by Accius and, because of *pernici orbificor liberorum leto et tabificabili* (421 R³), he supposes that Medea had two brothers (as, in his opinion, also in Sophocles' *Scythians* and in Dicaeogenes' tragedy) and that these verses should contain the words of the elder one, chosen by his father to chase the Argonauts (thus also most part of the commentators of the tragedians and of Cic. *Nat. Deor.* 3.67 who preserved the fragment). Regarding attribution of Accius' *Medea sive Argonautae* see Degl'Innocenti Pierini (1980: 149–53), who notices an allusion of Ov. *Tr.* 3.9.11–12 to the Accian passage of the shepherd astonished by the sight of the Argo, and from it she deduces that *adesp. TrRF* 1 74 belongs to the same play, believing that it is a messenger's speech. In favor of Ennius' *Medea exul* cf. Osann (1816: 125) and, among others, Rivoltella (2008: 8). About attribution to one of Cicero's contemporaries or to Cicero himself, cf. Arcellaschi (1990: 168). Do not take a stand: Klotz (1953: 343), Jocelyn (1967: 120) and Heinze (1997: 9).

42 Cf. Ap. Rh. 4.421–422; 464–481; Hyg. *Fab.* 23; *schol. ad Eur. Med.* 167 = 11.153.5–14 Schwartz, where it is claimed that Absyrtus is killed by the Argonauts.

43 Cf. maybe also Sophocles' *Women of Colchis*; Lyc. 1318; Apollod. 1.9.24; Cic. *Manil.* 22; Tz. *ad Lyc.* 175. On the basis of another version, dated to the time of Pherecyd. *FGrHist* 3 F 32a = *schol. ad Ap. Rh.* 4.223 and 3 F 32b = *schol. ad Ap. Rh.* 4.228, Medea has a less important role in murdering her brother: Jason orders her to drag Absyrtus off his bed, the Argonauts kill him, and the body, torn to pieces, is thrown into the Phasis (so also in Stat. *Theb.* 5.456–458).

44 On the attribution of this fragment to Ennius' *Medea exul*, already accepted, among others, by Vahlen (1903: 168), cf. Boscherini (1958: 106; 110–114).

Medea 476–482, with another echo at *Metamorphoses* 3.110 when Cadmus sews the dragon's teeth (*crescitque seges clipeata virorum*).⁴⁵ In this passage in the *Heroides*, Medea recalls when she put to sleep the dragon which guarded the Golden Fleece. She considers this action easier compared to her unsuccessful attempt of alleviate her suffering. Invoking past events, the heroine reveals more and more her tragic nature, which emerges as a consequence of a rejected love.

Medea makes a threat neither specifying its object or specifying what will happen if she does not get her way (*aposiopesis*) at *Heroides* 12.207 (*quos equidem actutum...*). The trope belongs to tragedy, such as in Naevius' *Lycurgus* (*TrRF I* 34.2) *ite actutum*, Pacuvius' *Dulorestes* (*R*³ 118) *aut hic est aut hic adfore actutum autumo*, and Accius' *Oenomaus* (*R*³ 508) *vos ite actutum atque opere magno edicite*.⁴⁶ Not only is *aposiopesis* a standard feature of tragedy but *actutum* also belongs to the dramatic language of archaic Latin; it is fairly rare in classical Latin.⁴⁷

Similarly, *viderit ista deus, qui nunc mea pectora versat!* / *Nescio quid certe mens mea maius agit* (be that the concern of the god who now embroils my heart! Something portentous, surely, is working in my soul!, *Heroides* 12.211–212) looks back to Accius' *Atrous*: *maior mihi moles, maius miscendumst malum, / qui illius acerbum cor contundam et comprimam* (200–201 *R*³). The line had already been adapted by Vergil *Aeneid* 9.186–187 and by Ovid himself at *Metamorphoses* 6.618–619 in which Procne is talking to her sister Philomela: *magnum quodcumque paravi: / quid sit, adhuc dubito*. Their revenge on Procne's husband who raped her sister, Philomela, will dissolve into a cannibalistic dinner in which Tereus is served his son and so was adapted likewise by Seneca in his *Thyestes* 267–70.⁴⁸

The sentence of Ovid's Medea comes as a warning, a premonition of the future, which Jason, the letter's recipient, unlike readers, does not yet know. The tension between elegy and tragedy here reaches its peak; the rising pathos and the strong presence of tragic irony determine a dramatic atmosphere, bringing the heroine back to her original dimension, the one of tragedy. "Medea is suggesting that a new poetic kind is called for: she could not write a letter about

45 Cf. also *Met.* 7.149 *pervigilem superest herbis sopire draconem*; 213; *Hyg. Fab.* 22.4; *Val. Fl.* 8.87.

46 Cf. also *Verg. Aen.* 9.255; *Ov. Met.* 3.557.

47 Cf. *TLL* I.455–456.

48 *Nescioquid animus maius et solito amplius / supraque fines moris humani tumet / instatque pigris manibus—haud quid sit scio, / sed grande quiddam est*. Cf. also *Seneca Med.* 50; 395; 674–675; 692–693; 908–910; 917–919.

her 'greater' actions, and this material, unspeakable for elegiacs, is reserved to the heights of a *cothurnata*.⁴⁹ The clue of this changing is the use of the verb *agit*, which indicates dramatic action⁵⁰ and which is here together with *maius*, which alludes to *genus grande*.⁵¹ But all this is always a consequence of love, as Ovid lets his character recall right to the end: *deus qui nunc mea pectora versat* (211).

2 Ovid *Heroides*. 16 (Paris to Helen) and 17 (Helen to Paris)

In the letters that contain the correspondence between Paris (16) and Helen (17), the scholarly consensus is that the pair shows a strong dependence on Latin archaic tragedy, particularly Ennius' *Alexander*.⁵² I discuss below the most relevant passages for the purposes of our paper.

Paris (i.e. Alexander) tells Helen of Hecuba's dream at *Heroides* 16.43–50:

*matris adhuc utero partu remorante tenebar;
iam gravidus iusto pondere venter erat.
Illa sibi ingentem visa est sub imagine somni
flammiferam pleno reddere ventre facem. 45
Territa consurgit metuendaque noctis opacae
visa seni Priamo, vatibus ille refert.
Arsurum Paridis vates canit Ilion igni:
pectoris, ut nunc est, fax fuit illa mei! 50*

49 Barchiesi (1993: 345).

50 Cf. *TLL* I.1398–1399.

51 Cf. Spoth (1992: 202–205), Hinds (1993: 41–42), Bessone (1997: 283–284), Tronchet (2009: 111 and 113), Videau (2009: 173–74) and Curley (2013: 11–12; 62; 82; 181 and 226–227).

52 Cf. already Ciofanus (1582: 28–29) and later Hartung (1844: 233–234 and 237), Zoellner (1892: 106–109) and Palmer (1898: 438–42); more recently, Jocelyn (1967: 77–78; 200; 214; 221 and 223), Jacobson (1968: 299–303), Gould White (1970: 190–91), Currie (1981: 2714–15) and Timpanaro (1996: 10–11; 24; 37; 39–40; 50–51 *et passim*). Besides a reuse of the Ennian tragedy, which is maybe the main source for these epistles, it has been presumed in Ovid a *contaminatio* of this with the Euripidean tragedy of the same name; cf. Snell (1937: 49 n. 2 and 59 n. 3). It is indeed very probable that *Her.* 16.89–90 *interea, credo versis ad prospera fatis, / regius agnoscor per rata signa puer* alludes to the *agnitio* via the *crepundia*, usual in Euripides' tragedy and not unlikely in the Ennian remake (cf. Serv. *ad Aen.* 5.370; *Mythogr.* 2.197; 3.11; 3.24). About the Ovidian use of *Cypria*, see, among others, Zoellner (1892: 55), Palmer (1898: xvi), Snell (1937: 25 n. 2), Jacobson (1968: 299), who does not exclude influences of Hellenistic models.

I was still in my mother's bosom, tardy of birth;
 her womb already was duly heavy with its load.
 It seemed to her in the vision of a dream that she put forth
 from her full womb a mighty flaming torch.
 In terror she rose up, and told the dread vision of opaque night
 to ancient Priam; he told it to his seers.
 One of the seers sang that Ilion would burn with the fire of Paris—
 that was the torch of my heart, as now has come to pass!

An echo can be detected in Ennius' *Alcmeo* (*TrRF II* 13.4–5) *fer mi auxilium, pestem abige a me, / flammiiferam hanc vim, quae me excruciat* but even more compelling is the unknown author of *adesp. TrRF I* 76 (cf. *Va*² 35–46 from Ennius' *Alexander*):⁵³

<i>mater <u>gravida</u> parere se <u>ardentem facem</u></i>	35
<i><u>visa est in somnis Hecuba</u>; quo facto <u>pater</u></i>	
<i>rex ipse <u>Priamus</u> somnio, mentis metu</i>	
<i>perculsus, curis sumptus suspirantibus,</i>	
<i>exsacrificabat hostiis balantibus.</i>	
<i>Tum coniecturam postulat pacem petens,</i>	40
<i>ut se edoceret obsecrans Apollinem,</i>	
<i>quo sese vertant tantae sortes <u>somnium</u>.</i>	
<i>Ibi ex oraclo voce divina edidit</i>	
<i>Apollo, puerum, primus Priamo qui foret</i>	
<i>postilla natus, temperaret tollere:</i>	45
<i>eum esse exitium Troiae, pestem Pergamo.</i>	

When mother Hecuba was great with child,
 she dreamed that she brought forth a flaming torch.
 Alarmed at this, with signing cares possessed,
 the king and father, Priam, to the gods
 did make a sacrifice of bleating lambs.
 He, seeking peace and answer to the dream,
 implored Apollo's aid to understand
 what great events the vision did foretell.

53 About the attribution of the fragment, transmitted by Cic. *Div.* 1.42, to Ennius' *Alexander*, see Hartung (1844: 234–235), Vahlen (1903: 124–125); Snell (1937: 22–24), Klotz (1953: 318), Jocelyn (1967: 77–78), Traglia (1986: 280–83) and Timpanaro (1988: 265 n. 150). Others ascribe it to Ennius' or Accius' *Hecuba*.

Apollo's oracle, with voice divine,
 then gave this explanation of the dream:
 "Thy next-born son forbear to rear, for he
 will be the death of Pergamos and Troy".

Helen picks up on Paris' language in her reply (*Heroides* 17.237–40):

*fax quoque me terret, quam se peperisse cruentam
 ante diem partus est tua visa parens;
 et vatum timeo monitus, quos igne Pelasgo
 Ilion arsurum praemonuisse ferunt.* 240

The torch, too, starts my fears—the bloody torch your mother
 brought forth in vision before the day of her travail;
 and I shrink at the words of the seers who they say forewarned
 that Ilion would burn with Pelasgian fire.

These lines also recall one of the most famous scenes in Roman Republican tragedy, in which Hecuba, pregnant with Paris, sees a firebrand in a dream (Ennius *inc. TrRF II* 151.10 = Ennius' *Alexander*, 48 R³): *adest, adest fax obvoluta sanguine atque incendio*. Paris himself makes an unconscious reference to the scene ('quo ruis?' exclamat, 'referes *incendia* tecum! / Quanta per has nescis flamma petatur aquas!' *Heroides* 16.123–124).⁵⁴ The soothsayer's fatal premonitions determine Priam to expose the infant setting in motion the destruction of Troy.

The verbal correspondences between the Ovidian passages and the tragic remains are noteworthy, as has often been noticed. Particularly remarkable, because not detectable elsewhere in Latin literature, are the use of *flammifer*, which only occurs at Ennius *TrRF II* 13.5 before it appears at *Heroides* 16.46,⁵⁵ and the peculiar syntactic construction of accusative subject + verb infinitive + personal passive main clause verb, which is found in extant Latin only at *Heroides* 16.45–46 and *adesp. TrRF I* 76.1–2. The two passages have the same context which further confirms the strong bonds between them.⁵⁶ What is

54 Cf. also Eur. *Tro.* 922; Dares 7; Apollod. 3.12.5; Hyg. *Fab.* 91; Dict. 3.26; Tz. *Antehom.* 40–48; *schol. A ad Hom. Il.* 3.325, p. 417.72–75 Erbse; *schol. ad Eur. Andr.* 293 (11.275.17–22 Schwartz).

55 Cf. Jacobson (1968: 301); on *flammifer* and similar compound words, frequent in tragedy but rare in classical Latin, cf. Jocelyn (1967: 200).

56 Cf. Hofmann and Szantyr (1972: 357).

3 Ovid *Heroides*. 13 and Pacuvius' Protesilaus. An Unsolved "Mystery"

I end this review of the reception of Latin archaic tragedy in the Ovidian elegy with the case of stated but not demonstrated nor demonstrable dependence of the second from the first. In the *argumentum* to *Heroides* 13, the letter of Laodamia to Protesilaus, the humanist Antonius Volscus states: "Pacuvius et Titinius Protesilaum tragoediam ediderunt: ex qua multum in hanc epistolam Ovidius transtulit" (Venetiis 1482). There are no other reports of a *Protesilaus* by Pacuvius (or one by Titinius) anywhere else except in this passage. Problems with his account such as classing Titinius, a writer of *togatae*, as an author of tragedy, has inclined scholars to think that Volscus' passage could be autoschediasm or (more generously) corrupted. But, if we accept the correction of *Titinius* to *Titius*, presumably to be identified with C. Titius, a rhetorician and tragedian mentioned in Cicero *Brutus* 167, as suggested by Dilthey,⁵⁹ it is more difficult—but not impossible—to suppose a second corruption of *Laevius* to *Pacuvius* in which case the name in Volscus could refer to Laevius' *Protesilaudamia*. Even conceding such a possibility does not perhaps gain us anything since Laevius' *Protesilaudamia* survives in such fragmentary condition as not to allow comparison with Ovid.

On the other hand, in other *argumenta* to the *Heroides*, Volscus gives precise quotations and is well informed of even scholarly minutia such as Accius' *Hecuba* of which only a single fragment survives.⁶⁰ It cannot be ignored that Volscus had been a pupil of Pomponius Laetus and his collaborator in the draft of the *editio princeps* of Nonius, the grammarian who is the single greatest source of quotations of Republican tragedy.⁶¹ Some scholars have presumed that Volscus drew information from Nonius and moreover from Classical authors, and therefore he knew works which later were lost and are completely unknown to us. The fact that in *Heroides* 13 there is a detail which is absent, for example, in the Hyginian *fabulae* on the same subject (*Fabulae* 103–104), that is, Protesilaus tripping over the threshold on his departure day to Troy, does not infer the existence of a Pacuvian *Protesilaus*: Ovid could have been inspired by Euripides' *Protesilaos*, of which only twelve fragments remain, or maybe by Sophocles' *Shepherds*, or by works of other authors, such as even Catullus 68. Therefore, this 'mystery' is still unsolved. If Pacuvius had written a tragedy on

59 Dilthey (1863: 59 with n. 1).

60 Noted in his *arg.* to Ov. *Her.* 4.

61 For biographic information on Antonius Volscus, cf. Mariano (1993: 108).

Protesilaus, it would have contributed to better enlighten the comparisons between tragedy and elegy and to deepen the discussion on this subject.⁶²

4 Conclusion

In the light of these comparisons, I think that it is possible to prove the existence of a living and informed reception of Latin archaic tragedy in Ovid's elegy. This reception, which could vary from evident textual and contextual recalls to mere presences of motives of other works or of other authors, always reveals itself functional and aimed at satisfying the target the poet has planned. The re-reading of tragic events in an elegiac way has various purposes as various are the poet's works, but in all these cases it is located in the vision of a literature *sub specie amoris*, testimony of the gradual passage from scenic performances to the readings and the recitals in private locations.

62 For uncertainty about the existence of a Pacuvian *Protesilaus*, among others, cf. Ribbeck (1875: 326), Klotz (1953: 165), Valsa (1957: 45), D'Anna (1967: 161; 180; 242–43), Currie (1981: 216–17), and Schierl (2006: 8–9). Opposite: Müller (1889: 5–6). In favor of a lost Pacuvian *Protesilaus*, cf. Warmington (1936: 286–87) and Magno (1977: 66).

Tragic Rome? Roman Historical Drama and the Genre of Tragedy

Lauren Donovan Ginsberg

Fabula praetexta is one of Latin literature's mysteries, a genre in which "even a single chance survival could change the whole picture."¹ The following recapitulates a typical handbook overview, although not all would agree on every point:

The genre began with Naevius who wrote a *Romulus* and a *Clastidium* on Rome's recent victory over the Insubrian Gauls (222 BC).² Subsequently, each major Republican tragedian wrote *praetextae*, often tackling both legendary and recent material: Ennius wrote a *Sabinae* and an *Ambracia* on the victory of Marcellus Fulvius Nobilior (189 BC), Pacuvius a *Paulus* on the victory of Lucius Aemilius Paullus (168 BC), Accius a *Brutus* and an *Aeneadae aut Decius* on the devotio of Publius Decius Mus at the battle of Sentinum (295 BC). Aristocrats commissioned these panegyric plays to celebrate Roman *res gestae*, and they were performed at self-congratulatory events such as triumphs and funerals, as well as during the regular annual *ludi scaenici*. Some *praetextae* had an aetiological function: Varro (*De linguae latinae* 6.18–19) refers to a play on the Nonae Caprotinae in which slave girls impersonate Roman matrons to save them from violation, and Ovid (*Fasti* 4.326) mentions a drama on the tribulations of vestal Claudia Quinta. The paucity of fragments—only 40 survive, some mere words or titles—is evidence for the genre's rarity, and the quality of surviving fragments (characterized by stilted and archaic language) suggests a reason why. *Praetexta* never became as artistically sophisticated as its tragic counterpart, and thus eventually declined in popularity. While we hear of some historical dramas under the empire including our sole complete exemplar the *Octavia* and Tacitus' reference to a *Cato*, these seem less like celebratory Republican *praetextae* than tragedies in Roman dress unrelated to their predecessors.

1 Kragelund (2002: 24).

2 Manuwald (2001: 128–29); Erasmo (2004: 53); Boyle (2006: 12–14, 36–37, 42); cf. also Bernstein (2002). Kragelund (2002: 12) compiles a chart of surviving evidence for *praetextae*. For the generic name cf. Manuwald (2001: 15–29).

What must be made clear, however, is how uncertain our evidence is, how much our knowledge rests on assumptions about what the genre should be, and thus how tenuous our interpretations of the genre or its individual exemplars must remain. I do not intend to explore all the aspects listed above. Over the past twenty years, scholars have advanced our understanding, for example, of performance contexts,³ the genre's relationship to the historical record,⁴ and its religious and aetiological character.⁵ Studies have questioned longstanding assumptions about the genre's popularity throughout its history.⁶ Moreover, we now have an overview of the genre and its controversies that synthesizes all the disparate evidence,⁷ while two new surveys of Roman tragedy include *praetexta* in their purview.⁸ These advances in understanding the genre, in turn, have set the stage well for reconsidering one of the genre's thorniest issues: its relationship with tragedy.

From their emergence in the third century BC through the empire, Roman tragedy and historical drama shared a close bond. While Greek historical drama was an undifferentiated and likely rare subspecies of tragedy, Roman *praetexta* became a distinct genre dedicated not to tragedy's universalizing pathos, but to the particularized events of Roman history.⁹ At the heart of modern distinctions between the two genres is the idea that historical drama's overt praise of Rome is incompatible with the true nature of tragedy.¹⁰ And yet despite this,

3 Cf. Flower (1995) on the *ludi votivi* contra Zorzetti (1980: 58–67) on triumphs and Dupont (1985: 218–24) on funerals; cf. also Kragelund (2002: 19–22).

4 Cf. especially Wiseman (1998).

5 Kragelund (2002); cf. also Jocelyn (2000: 346–47); Boyle (2006: 139–40).

6 On the genre's rarity, cf. Flower (1995: 187–90) and Manuwald (2001: 127–29). Some, however, argue that our evidence obscures more than clarifies the genre's activity and artistic influence: Wiseman (1998: esp. 1–16); Kragelund (2002); Garelli (2007: 150–51).

7 Manuwald (2001).

8 Boyle (2006) and Erasmo (2004). Boyle (2006: 49–51) is especially useful on aspects of *praetexta* that link it to and separate it from our traditional ideas of tragedy.

9 Scholarship illustrates this tension: Boyle (2006), Erasmo (2004) and Manuwald (2000) include *praetextae* in their studies of Roman tragedy as did Ribbeck (1871) in his collection of tragic fragments, but the new *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta* vol. 1 and 2 (2012) do not, indicating that *praetexta*'s generic status is still up for debate. For the parallel issues involved in the comparatively rare genre of Greek historical tragedy, cf. Garvie (2009: ix–xxxi). On the likely significance of intervening Hellenistic historical dramas, cf. Grimal (1975: 274–75); Manuwald (2001: 254–58); Garelli (2007: 150–53).

10 On *praetexta* as panegyric for *imperium*, cf. Zorzetti (1980: 53–74); Dupont (1985: 215–28); Flower (1995: 172–82); Manuwald (2001: 254); Petrone (2001: 170–73); Kragelund (2002: 17); Schmidt (2007); Gildenhard (2010: 157–58). For similar issues with Aeschylus' *Persae*, cf. Garvie (2009: ix–xxxi).

I suggest, *praetexta* never quite severs its tragic connections. On the contrary, in structure, poetics, language, performance, and theme, it remains connected to its more famous dramatic counterpart. It is the relationship between what is Roman and celebratory on the one hand and what is tragic on the other that makes *praetexta* rich for study.

This chapter reinvestigates this relationship chronologically from Naevius to the genre's final flourish under the Flavians.¹¹ Through the fragments and ancient definitions of the genre, I approach this question from multiple vantage points, looking not only at the genres' formal characteristics (e.g., language, meter, structure), but also at their thematic similarities. While this study must touch on the controversial issue of continuity between historical drama's Republican and Imperial forms, I do not intend to delineate a unified scheme into which all exemplars must fit.¹² Rather, this paper investigates the myriad connections between historical drama and mythological tragedy to suggest new avenues of inquiry into this elusive yet important genre of Roman drama.

1 Defining *Praetexta*: Evidence and Limitations

It is difficult to begin a discussion of the generic characteristics of *praetexta* with the plays themselves. Only a handful of fragments survive, primarily in the work of later antiquarians with a penchant for rare words, and thus we cannot know how representative our fragments are. Thus it is easier to begin

11 My chronological boundaries, however, need not *a priori* contradict hypotheses about a lively theatrical scene in Italy prior to Livius Andronicus, cf. especially Wiseman (1998: 12–16). In fact, such a generically-fluid past for serious drama would support the hybridity and flexibility that I argue is a central component of *praetexta*. For the wider history of this debate, cf. and Gildenhard (2010: 156–59).

12 For generic continuity, cf. Kragelund (2002) and Garelli (2007: 154–59). For a break, cf. Zorzetti (1980: 93–103); Schmidt (1985) and (2007); Erasmo (2004: 67–68). On when a transition may have begun: Manuwald (2001: 128) and Kragelund (2002: 27–34); cf. Balbus' *Iter* (a play dramatizing Balbus' mission to Pompey's camp during the civil wars) as a turning point. Others highlight Accius' transitional status: Zorzetti (1980: 93–103), Goldberg (2005: 17 with n. 41), Schmidt (2007). The *Octavia* is a good case study on this issue: Zorzetti (1980: 93–103), Dupont (1985: 226–28), and Schmidt (1985) and (2007) consider it "historical tragedy", not *praetexta*; Manuwald (2001: 261–305) and Kragelund (2002) challenge this. The near total loss of Roman serious drama outside of the Senecan corpus renders certainty impossible.

not with the genre's surviving traces but with the somewhat richer evidence for how Roman intellectuals defined it.¹³

The ancient intellectual tradition clearly defined historical drama's relationship to tragedy. In his commentary on the comedies of Terence, Donatus cited the discussion of Euanthius (fourth century AD): "*praetext(at)ae* [so called] from the dignity of tragic characters from Latin history" (*praetextatas a dignitate personarum tragicarum ex Latina historia*).¹⁴ Elsewhere Donatus held that "tragedy, if it has a Latin plot, is called *praetexta*" (*tragoedia, si Latina argumentatio sit, praetexta dicitur*).¹⁵ Scholars have shown that these definitions are part of a wider schematization of ancient drama which differentiated primarily between comedy and tragedy; in other words, this system considered both mythological dramas and *praetexta* under the umbrella category 'tragedy.'

Diomedes, another fourth century AD grammarian, offered evidence of a different system of categorization. According to Diomedes, *praetext(at)ae* are plays:¹⁶

... in quibus imperatorum negotia agebantur et publica et reges Romani vel duces inducuntur, personarum dignitate et {personarum} sublimitate tragoediis similes.

... in which the dealings of generals or public issues are performed, and Roman kings or leaders are brought on stage, similar to tragedies in the dignity of their characters and in loftiness.

He also notes:¹⁷

praetextata a tragoedia differt, quod in tragoedia heroes inducuntur, ut Pacuvius tragoedias nominibus heroicis scripsit, Orestem Chrysen et his

13 What follows owes much to Manuwald (2001: 29–52) and Garelli (2007: 144–48) who illustrate the grammatical tradition's significance for studying *praetextae*.

14 *De Fabula* 4.1. For the text and further discussion, cf. Manuwald (2001: 37–39). For consistency and ease of reference for the reader, I follow Manuwald's (2001) text throughout for the fragments of Republican *praetextae* and for the ancient grammatical tradition about them. Any divergences from Manuwald (2001) text will be noted. All translations are my own.

15 *Com.* 6.1 with Manuwald (2001: 41–43). This definition appears translated verbatim in Lydos *mag.* 1.40; cf. Manuwald (2001: 41–43) and Cupaiuolo (1979: 61–67).

16 *Ars. Gram.* 3 with Manuwald (2001: 30–36).

17 Op. cit. n. 16.

similia, item Attius; in praetextata autem quae inscribitur Brutus vel Decius, item Marcellus.

praetext(at)a differs from tragedy in that in tragedy heroes are brought on stage, like when Pacuvius wrote tragedies with heroic names—Orestes, Chryses, and plays similar to these, likewise Attius; in praetext(at)a, however, the names that are written are Brutus or Decius, likewise Marcellus.

While on the surface his definitions may seem identical to Euanthius' /Donatus', Diomedes' view of drama presupposed a primary division between Greek and Roman material rather than between comedy and tragedy, with *praetextae* as the nearest equivalent to tragedy under the separate category of plays on Roman subjects.¹⁸

This Diomedian evidence is significant for two reasons. First, it adds another independent analysis of the genre's status that likewise views it as akin to tragedy in its lofty subject matter and characters. Second, and more importantly, is that Diomedes' source was likely Varro who not only witnessed stage performances of the still-vibrant genre, but was a leading intellectual in the movement to systematize genres and literary canons at Rome (see below 221–23).¹⁹ This Varronian evidence is complemented in turn by another intellectual who shared his outlook on praetexta: Horace.

In his *Ars Poetica*, Horace singled out *praetexta* within the development of Roman literature. While his aim was not a systematic classification of drama, he nevertheless provides insight from the perspective of Augustan Rome:²⁰

*Nil intemptatum nostri liquere poetae,
nec minimum meruere decus vestigia Graeca
ausi deserere et celebrare domestica facta,
vel qui praetextas, vel qui docuere togatas*

Our poets have left nothing unattempted, nor have they earned less glory because they dared to abandon Greek footpaths and to celebrate domestic deeds, either those who produce *praetextae*, or those who produce *togatae*.

18 Cupaiuolo (1979: 61–67); Manuwald (2001: 32–33); Garelli (2007: 144–48).

19 For Varro as Diomedes' source, op. cit. n. 16.

20 Hor. *Ars.P.* 285–288.

Implicit in Horace's final line was the ideological distinction between *praetextae* and *togatae* as Roman equivalents of tragedy and comedy. Moreover to Horace, *praetexta* was symbolic of a Roman "nationalistic" movement to match and even surpass the Greek literary canon. This can be seen in the preceding lines that described the origins of Greek drama as the backdrop to his analysis of Roman innovation within and against that system.²¹

This idea of Roman intellectual rivalry within and against the Greek canon was central to Horace's account of *praetexta*. He claimed great ingenuity for the Roman poets (*ausi*) whose focus on domestic achievements (*domestica facta*) offered an innovative space for memorializing (*celebrare...docuere*) their collective history.²² And yet this innovation happened within the framework of Greek tradition (*vestigia Graeca*), implying that Roman poets followed Greek tragic models even while forging new, Roman adaptations of them. The literary-critical term *vestigium* combined with Horace's preceding mention of Greek dramatic genres suggests that *praetexta*'s innovation lay in content rather than form. We are unable to say more about his views from the passage at hand, but the connections made by later grammarians seem implicitly borne out in Augustan Rome, even as Horace adds to our fragmented picture an emphasis the genre's celebratory and didactic purpose.

When we combine Horace with Diomedes' Varronian evidence, we thus appear to have two contemporary witnesses asserting the genre's independence from yet connection to Greek-style tragedy, a claim with long-lasting influence on future scholars. Each implicitly pitted Roman literature and subjects as rivals to their Greek counterparts. Through *praetexta*, Horace suggested, Roman drama deliberately differentiated itself from the Greek cultural hegemony. But, as Garelli argues, we must be wary of taking at face value this ideologically charged reconstruction of *praetexta*'s origins.²³ Instead, we must consider the cultural contexts in which Horace and Varro wrote.

The term *praetexta* itself may only date to the late Republic where it is first attested. If true, then the genre was first given its traditional name—and thus perhaps even first recognized as a separate genre—during a period otherwise marked by artistic innovation and an interest in codifying Roman literature

21 Hor. *Ars.P.* 275–284.

22 What follows builds on Brink (1971), Petrone (2000: 113–14) and (2001: 167–68), and Garelli (2007: 149–50). For the influence of this 'Horatian paradigm' on the study of Republican theater generally, cf. Gildenhard (2010: 158–60).

23 Garelli (2007: 49–50); cf. also Horsfall (1994) and Wiseman (1998: 12–16).

into a recognizable counterpart to the Greek canon.²⁴ What was Greek versus Roman became an important question that lay behind Horace's statements.²⁵ *Vestigia Graeca* versus *domestica facta* created oppositions between 'ours' and 'other,' between passive, Greek *vestigia* and active, Roman *facta*.²⁶ In other words, our earliest surviving classification of *praetexta* occurred when intellectuals began to systematize Roman literature as part of a wider challenge to Greek literature's cultural supremacy. While Horace implicitly posited a rivalry between *praetexta* and Greek mythological tragedy, we must pause before we reproject this view onto the genre's origins.²⁷

Throughout its development from Naevius onward, *praetexta* remained the purview of tragic poets, and thus we must reconsider the evidence for how different the genres were at the start. In other words, when Naevius wrote his *Romulus* and *Clastidium*, did he daringly set out to create a new, specifically Roman genre as Horace suggested (*ausi*)? Likewise, when Ennius followed with his *Ambracia* and *Sabinae*, Pacuvius with his *Paulus* and Accius with his *Brutus* and *Aeneadae aut Decius*, did they view them as generically different from their tragedies?

Given the standard chronologies of Livius Andronicus' and Naevius' activity, any 'nationalistic break' on the Horatian model must have happened almost immediately upon Greek tragedy's introduction to Rome.²⁸ In other words, we must imagine that just as Rome's playwrights were first experimenting with a generic form (Greek-style tragedy) that had lasting significance throughout the Republic and Empire, those same authors were simultaneously attempting to break away from its influence as part of a self-consciously nationalistic imperative. Instead, it seems more useful to view Rome's two early modes of engaging with Greek tragedy (mythological and historical) in complementary terms, as two modes of Roman experimentation within a new cultural import.

This accords well with the contemporary development of another poetic genre: epic. While Livius Andronicus is conventionally credited with introducing Greek-style epics to Rome through his Latin *Odusseia*, Naevius further innovated by applying that epic form to Roman history with the *Bellum*

24 Cic. *Ad Fam.* 10.32.3–5 with Manuwald (2001: 54–62) and Varr. *LL* 6.18–19 with Manuwald (2001: 66–67). Manuwald thinks the ease with which Pollio and Varro use the term *praetexta* indicates that it predates them, as does Flower (1995: 171). Goldberg (2003: 27 with n.30) and Garelli (2007: 146–50) suggest it derives from Cicero's generation.

25 Petrone (2001) 167–68; Kragelund (2002: 18–19); Garelli (2007: 149–50). Cf. also Brink (1971 ad *Ars. P.* 285–88).

26 Op. cit. n. 20.

27 Garelli (2007: 149–50).

28 Op. cit. n. 25.

Punicum, creating a fusion of Hellenized form with Roman material.²⁹ His *Romulus* and *Clastidium* can be viewed as analogous experiments that fuse Greek tragic form and Roman *res gestae*, and he is followed in both genres by Ennius through the epic *Annales* and the dramas, *Sabinae* and *Ambracia*. That the later tradition did not differentiate between genres of epic (historical vs. mythological), but did draw a distinction between these two genres of drama (*praetexta* vs. tragedy) does not mean that such distinctions were required or intended by early authors at the time.

Thus, when it comes to the intellectual tradition of defining *praetexta*'s relationship with tragedy, we must be cautious in applying the retrospective definitions of *praetexta* to the fragments themselves, especially those that predate the late Republic's systematization. Instead we must read with an eye towards evaluating whether the opposition posited by Horace and others between Greek/tragic vs. Roman/celebratory is borne out. It is to these plays that we now turn, beginning with an investigation of the formal characteristics and Republican contexts of the two genres in order to see how firm the boundaries between history and tragedy were during Roman drama's development.

2 Delineating Genres: Parallels in Contexts, Form, and Theme

From a performance perspective, there was little distinction between tragedy and *praetexta*. Rome did not differentiate between days on which various types of drama were performed, and tragedies and *praetextae* were perhaps especially interchangeable.³⁰ Nor was there a distinction in actors: in the late Republic Cicero recorded that an actor inserted lines from Accius' *Brutus* into a mythological tragedy, and in the early Empire Manilius noted that tragic actors could play either mythological heroes or Roman generals.³¹

When we consider formal aspects, the line between genres further blurs.³² All surviving fragments of Republican *praetextae* fit into the typical metrical schemes of early Latin tragedy (iambic senarii, trochaic septenarii, or anapests),

29 And, much like with *praetexta*, he had Greek precedent for such a project (e.g. Choerilus of Samos's *Persica*).

30 Manuwald (2001: 128) and Boyle (2006: 50).

31 For Aesopus' transposition of lines from Accius' *Eurysaces*, *Brutus*, and Ennius' *Andromada*, cf. Cic. *Sest.* 120–24 discussed by Erasmo (2001: 104–5); Manuwald (2001: 62–5 and 234–37); Boyle (2006: 152–55). Cf. also Man. *Ast.* 5.482 *scaenisque togatos aut magnos heroas aget*.

32 For the formal connections between tragedy and *praetexta*, cf. further La Penna (1979: 51–56).

and the fragments of both genres show evidence of a rich combination of song and speech.³³ Moreover, surviving *praetextae* exhibit a self-consciously lofty poetic vocabulary like tragedy while a core group of stylistic devices connect the genres (e.g. alliteration, artificial word order, paranomasia, metaphors).³⁴

Praetexta's characters also reflected tragic conventions. We have seen the importance of status for each genre's protagonists, and *praetexta* also borrowed tragedy's stock characters (e.g. nurses, messengers, prophets, choruses).³⁵ We also have many examples of women taking the active roles they often play in tragedy.³⁶ Furthermore, as opposed to other contemporary drama, the gods were central to both historical and mythological drama.³⁷ While the absence of evidence for *dei ex machina* might suggest that gods did not play as active a role in *praetexta*,³⁸ the role of the gods in Rome's triumphs—and the thanks owed the gods by Rome's citizens—rendered *praetextae* no less interested in the divine than contemporary tragedies.³⁹

Thematic parallels urge us to view the two genres as in dialogue from at least the third century BC onward. Early Roman tragedies treat many myths, yet playwrights may have been drawn to those aetiologically connected to

-
- 33 In addition to La Penna (op. cit.), cf. Manuwald (2001: 250). See also more generally Kragelund (2002: 8); Boyle (2006: 49–50).
- 34 Manuwald (2001: 250–51). Manuwald finds fewer polysyllabic words in the fragments of *praetexta*, but this may be a reflection of the evidence. Cf. also Goldberg (2007: 574–75). In terms of word choice, Naevius uses the same unusual word *vitulantis* in his *Lycurgus* (1 TrRF) and in his *Clastidium* (Manuwald 2001, fr 1). Elsewhere in the *Clastidium* his phrasing of *vita insepulta* (Manuwald 2001, fr 2) is poetically striking. Ennius' appeal to Neptune in the *Ambracia* is artful (*et aequora salsa vege ingentibus ventis* Manuwald 2001, fr 4), while the wordplay and metaphors for which Pacuvius' tragedies are known likewise color his *Paulus* (*sagittis nivit*, Manuwald 2001, fr 3; *caprigeno generi*, Manuwald 2001, fr 4, but I differ from Manuwald and follow the majority of editors in preferring the manuscripts' *generi* to emendations of *pecori* for this reason). For literary devices see, e.g., the alliteration and line framing in Pacuvius' *Paulus* (*pater supreme, nostrae progenii patris*, Manuwald 2001, fr 1) or the pun in Accius' *Brutus* (*is sapientia munitum pectus egregie gerat/ teque regno expellat*, Manuwald 2001, fr 2.5–6).
- 35 Manuwald (2001: 252); Kragelund (2002: 8); Ballairà (2002: 52–57); Boyle (2006: 18–19).
- 36 E.g., Ennius' *Sabinae* or the *Claudia Quinta*.
- 37 Kragelund (2002: 8 and 17–18); cf. Ennius' *Ambracia* (frag. 4 Manuwald) with Erasmo (2004: 73), Pacuvius' *Paulus* (Manuwald 2001, fr 1), and Accius' *Decius* (Manuwald 2001, fr 4 and 5).
- 38 Manuwald (2001: 252–53), contra Petrone (2001: 170) who argues that the gods intervened in *praetextae* to show divine sanction of *imperium*.
- 39 Cf. also Flower (1995: 181–87) and Petrone (2000: 115). For *praetexta*'s aetiological focus, cf. Kragelund (2002: 17–22).

Rome.⁴⁰ Six of Livius Andronicus' eight attested tragedies and five of Naevius' seven dealt with the Trojan War, an event of interest to Roman historical imagination long before Vergil. Evidence suggests that plays about Danae, Philoctetes, Atreus, and others might also have connected those heroes with Italy.⁴¹ While we do not have the evidence to assert either that all playwrights uniformly privileged myths with Italian associations or that their audiences were uniformly interested in these connections, even a conservative analysis suggests that Roman tragedy was exploring from the beginning different ways of relating Greek myths to Rome. This renders it more difficult to distinguish the potential patriotic impulses of tragedies of Troy from, e.g., a *praetexta* on Romulus, the grandson of Aeneas in Ennius' *Annales* and presumably in his *Sabinae*.⁴² Such evidence instead suggests possibilities for overlap between mythological tragedy and *praetextae* on legendary subjects.

But what could *praetextae* on contemporary victories have in common with mythological tragedy? Although we must be careful not to over interpret the evidence to find pointed and programmatic allusions to contemporary politics in Republican tragedy, so too we must be wary of divorcing those tragedies from the cultural contexts that produced them. Several fragments of Livius Andronicus addressed how one should confront the conclusion of war, how victors should behave, and the role of justice, fairness and piety in such situations, themes even more significant when read against the background of the Punic wars.⁴³ Likewise, the boundary-annihilating, Eastern god of Naevius' *Lycurgus* possibly responded to a general anxiety about foreign cults at Rome.⁴⁴ Some push this further to see in Ennius' *Thyestes* a reflection on contemporary Roman attitudes towards king Perseus in the Third Macedonian War,⁴⁵ or to see the Gracchan crisis as an important backdrop to Accius' plays on tyranny and oppression.⁴⁶ Though the debate over politics and Republican tragedy is hardly settled, few would disagree with Gildenhard that "positing thematic correlations between the contents of Greek mythological tragedies and political issues that would have preoccupied the Roman audience is, at any rate,

40 Schiesaro (2005: 271); Boyle (2006: 37–38); cf. also Jocelyn (2000: 331–37).

41 Boyle (2006: 127–28); Jocelyn (2000: 332–34). Boyle (2006: 39) sees an aetiological interest in Naevius' *Danae*: local tradition claimed her as the foundress of Ardea (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 7.409–410). Lefèvre (2000) suggests a connection to Saguntum.

42 Marshall (2002: 76–77).

43 Manuwald (2011: 191 and 199) on Naevius in particular.

44 Boyle (2006: 47–49) and Flower (2000) respectively, though Flower is more cautious.

45 Chaumartin (2002: 58–59); Boyle (2006: 78–83).

46 Boyle (2006: 126–33).

methodologically rather unproblematic.”⁴⁷ This makes it all the harder to differentiate firmly Republican tragedy from historical drama on the criteria of topicality.

Nevertheless, despite these points of similarity, surviving evidence also hints at divergences. For example, the *praetexta*'s chorus—often identified as Roman citizens—may have actively influenced the play's events.⁴⁸ *Praetextae* may also have differed from tragedy in their handling of time and space.⁴⁹ The imperial *Octavia* has a multi-day structure and some posit that Naevius' *Romulus*, Accius' *Brutus*, and Balbus' *Iter* took place over more than one day.⁵⁰ *Praetextae* perhaps also violated unity of place: *Octavia*'s final harbor scene, the journey required by Balbus' *Iter*, and Ovid's account of Claudia Quinta suggest multiple locations.⁵¹ While this evidence is far from secure, our fragments suggest an experimental genre that tested and altered conventions inherited from tragedy.

Composition contexts foreground another difference, given that Roman aristocrats might seem to have had a heavier involvement in the development of plays written specifically to celebrate their own achievements.⁵² Ennius was present at the events of the *Ambracia*, while Accius was the amicus of Decimus Junius Brutus Callaicus for whom his *Brutus* was presumably written.⁵³ From

47 Gildenhard (2010: 161). By Cicero's day, Roman audiences expected to find political commentary within mythological drama or to supply their own (cf. Cic. *Sest.* 118–22; Cic. *Att.* 16.5.1). But see the note of caution on retrojecting this evidence urged by Goldberg (1989), Manuwald (2001: 135) and (2011: 134–35), and Gildenhard (2010: 168–72). For the political engagement of earlier Roman drama see, for example, the discussions in Boyle (2006: e.g. 158–59) and Flower (1995: 189–90).

48 Wiseman (1998: 57); Manuwald (2001: 251); Kragelund (2002: 45); Ferri (2003b: 89 n. 2). Evidence includes, e.g., a chorus of soldiers in Accius' *Decius* (contra Erasmo's Gallic chorus) and the chorus(es) of citizens in the *Octavia* (cf. below n. 97). That *praetextae* offered their Roman audiences a direct window into their own (often recent) history might explain this increased prominence.

49 Kragelund (2002: 41–45) and Ballaira (2002: 53); cf. also, contra, Manuwald (2001: 253–54). For the potential influence of lost intervening Hellenistic dramas, cf. Grimal (1975: 274–75); Manuwald (2001: 254–58); Garelli (2007: 150–53).

50 Kragelund (2002: 45); Ferri (2003b: 89 and 107); Wilson (2003: 5); Fitch (2004: 508); Boyle (2006: 225). Cf., contra, Manuwald (2001: 267 and 331–32).

51 Boyle (2006: 141–142). Jocelyn (2000: 344), however, argues that Republican drama adhered to this principle.

52 Zorzetti (1980: 54); Flower (1995: 171–72); Kragelund (2002: 27–28, on Accius' *Brutus*); Erasmo (2004: 53 and 67); Schiesaro (2005: 273). On the slippery evidence, cf. Goldberg (1989: 254).

53 For Ennius and Nobilior, cf. Goldberg (1989).

this evidence and from our knowledge of later systems of patronage some suggest that, once commissioned for a *praetexta*, Rome's leading tragedians became less the artists of serious, innovative drama and more the mouthpieces of important aristocrats.⁵⁴ Moreover, many see this 'panegyric tendency' as the fundamental difference between Republican *praetextae* and Imperial historical dramas which resembled tragedy with their tyrants and bloodshed.⁵⁵

Republican *praetextae* were indisputably celebratory. Horace stated that *praetextae* celebrate Roman deeds (*celebrare domestica facta*) and a fragment of Varro implied that the historical drama about the *Nonae Caprotinae* taught (*docuit*) the Roman people a lesson.⁵⁶ But we must pause before equating celebration with panegyric and assuming that celebration stands at odds with tragedy.⁵⁷ As Goldberg argues, there is "more to the genre than political puffery and familial prestige. Its celebration of legendary as well as contemporary deeds suggests a literary form that used the stage, the first medium for serious literary expression in Latin, to define a context for Roman achievement—not simply to glorify it."⁵⁸ In fact, as the surviving fragments show, Roman triumph was less at odds with the themes of tragedy than one might think.

3 The Republican Fragments: Celebration through Tragedy?

The scanty remains of Republican *praetextae* suggest many avenues for exploring the genre's tragic affinities. Within this staged narrative tradition of Roman triumph and celebration are fragments that question the value of victory in civil war, articulate the painful losses of Rome's vanquished enemy, and mourn those citizens who sacrificed their lives *pro patria*. Through an artistic manipulation of tragic forms, Roman poets developed a serious and contemplative genre for commemorating Roman achievements.

54 E.g. Zorzetti (1980); Schmidt (1985); Beacham (1999: 5). Many extrapolate that *praetextae* were predominantly a spectacle of *imperium*: Zorzetti (1980: 53–74); Dupont (1985: 215–28); Flower (1995: 180–82); Petrone (2001: 170–73). Contra, Kragelund (2002: 17–27); cf. also Goldberg (1989: 250–51) who warns against taking poetic patronage from later periods as evidence for the high Republic.

55 Zorzetti (1980: 93–103); Schmidt (1985); Flower (1995: 171–72); Petrone (2001: 169); Manuwald (2001: 94–97); Ferri (2002: 60–63).

56 Hor. *Ars. P.* 287 and Varro *LL* 6.18.

57 Petrone (2001: 17–25); Manuwald (2001: 250–52); Erasmo (2004: 56–57); Mayer (2006: 296).

58 Goldberg (1989: 254). He and Kragelund (2002: 17–25) suggest we compare the *Aeneid's* praise of Augustus and the Julians. Cf. also Ballaira (2002: 55); Marshall (2002: 76–77); Tarrant (2002: 79).

Our lone fragment of Ennius' *Sabinae* dramatizes the tensions of civil war central to Roman discussions of identity: "when you have stripped spoils from your sons-in-law, what dedicatory inscription will you write?" (*cum spolia generis detraxeritis, / quam <patres> inscriptionem dabitis*).⁵⁹ This line likely came at the moment when the *Sabinae* step between warring *soceri* and *generi*.⁶⁰ While the language of spoils and dedicatory inscriptions conjures up the trappings of imperium associated with *praetextae*, the strife-ridden context undercuts any pure championing of Roman glory.⁶¹ The intertextual pedigree of the line is also telling: Ennius borrowed his language from Euripides' *Phoenissae* where Jocasta addressed Polynices on the difficulties of waging war against one's homeland.⁶² Much recent work has explored the role of intertextuality in Roman historiography, but few have considered the rich (even if fragmented) evidence provided by *praetextae* in this regard.⁶³ While such a discussion is beyond the scope of this chapter, it is clear that Ennius articulated the impossible situation engendered by Roman discord through allusion to an Attic tragedy on similar themes. In doing so, he asked his audience to compare Greek tragedy with Roman *praetexta* and within that comparison to generate meaning. That the *Sabinae* (unlike the *Phoenissae*) ended happily does not obscure its tragic elements; the intertext highlights how Greek tragic forms can be used for celebrating Roman history.

We might expect less tragedy from Ennius' *Ambracia* which celebrated foreign conquest. And indeed one of our four surviving fragments praises Nobilior in traditional terms: "you offer good counsel; but you yourself be held back.

59 Enn. *Sab.* frag. 1 with Manuwald (2001: 172–79).

60 For the textual difficulties and ethical contradictions, cf. Joceyln (1972: 82–88) and Manuwald (2001: 172–79). For the *concordia* theme in the *Sabinae* and other Republican tragedies, cf. La Penna (2000) who articulates well the ideological associations of Ennius' topic.

61 Ennius' reimagining of Rome's legendary *discordia* may have been influenced by the recent dedication of a temple to *Concordia* in Rome's urban center. Cf. Boyle (2006: 85–86) on the temple's politicizing of 'civic fragility.'

62 φέρ', ἣν ἔλῃσι γῆν τήνδ', ὃ μὴ τύχοι ποτέ / πρὸς θεῶν, τροπαῖα πῶς ἄρα στήσεις Δί / πῶς δ' αὖ κατάρξῃ θυμάτων, ἐλὼν πάτραν, / καὶ σκύλα γράψεις πῶς ἐπ' Ἰνάρχου ῥοαῖς; / Θήβας πυρώσας τάσδε Πολυνείκης θεοῖς / ἀσπίδας ἔθηκε; (Eur. *Phoen.* 571–76). For interpretations, cf. Joceyln (1972: 82–88); La Penna (2000: 246–49); Manuwald (2001: 178–79); Erasmo (2004: 59 n.29); Boyle (2006: 86–87); cf. Eur. *Tro.* 1188–1191 with Manuwald (2001: 179).

63 On intertextuality and historiography, cf. O'Gorman (2007) and (2009); Damon (2010), Marincola (2010); Levene (2011).

Behold the brave man!" (*bene mones, tute ipse cunctato. Vide fortem virum!*).⁶⁴ And yet Roman triumphs required non-Roman defeats, and thus Ennius also portrayed the extreme wretchedness of another character, likely Aetolian: "he was famed throughout different peoples as the most wretched of all men" (*pergentes esse cluebat omnium miserrimus*).⁶⁵ Ennius' use of the poetic *cluebat* as well as the superlative *miserrimus*—itself postponed artfully—emphasizes in tragic terms this character's losses. Another fragment may highlight the tragic reversals of the foreign other whose "slaves boldly despoil the fields of their masters at home" (*agros audaces depopulant servi dominorum domi*).⁶⁶ Note how the harsh alliterative 'd's, the etymological play with *dominorum* and *domi*, and the antithesis between *servi* and *dominorum* all highlight the moral condemnation and upheaval implied by the line.

Boethius suggested similar emotional undercurrents for another 'triumphal' *praetexta* when his interlocutor Fortuna wonders whether "it has escaped your notice that Lucius Aemilius Paulus shed pious tears for the calamities of Perseus, the king he captured?" (*num te praeterit Paulum Persi regis a se capti calamitatibus pias impendisse lacrimas?*).⁶⁷ That this anecdote refers to Pacuvius' *praetexta* is suggested in the next lines where Fortuna connects Perseus' fall and Paulus' reaction with the experience of tragedy: "what else does the clamor of tragedies lament but Fortune overthrowing happy kingdoms with an unexpected blow?" (*quid tragoediarum clamor aliud deflet nisi indiscreto ictu Fortunam felicia regna vertentem?*).⁶⁸ This suggests that Pacuvius painted Perseus' fall as a tragedy that moved even the *triumphator* Paulus. While triumphal *praetextae* celebrate Roman victory, they may simultaneously dramatize in tragic terms the experience of the defeated or the reversals that precede victory.

64 Enn. *Amb.* frag. 2. I here deviate from Manuwald (*cunctat, o vide*) and follow Vahlen (1928) who reads *cunctato vide*. For the textual difficulties of this fragment and various reconstructions, cf. Manuwald (2001: 162–72).

65 Enn. *Amb.* frag. 1 Manuwald (2001: 162–72). I follow Boyle (2006: 84–86) and Warmington (1935: 358–59) in taking fragments 1 and 3 as referring to an Aetolian, but this is speculative. If these fragments referred to Nobilior or the Romans instead, the tragic *pathos* would only increase; cf. also Erasmo (2004: 71–73).

66 Enn. *Amb.* frag. 3 Manuwald (2001: 162–72).

67 Boeth. *Cons.* 2.2.12.

68 Op. cit. Manuwald (2001: 181 and 193–96); Boyle (2006: 106–107); cf. certain triumphal processions when audiences were likewise moved to pity: Beard (2007: 136–39).

Accius' *Aeneadae aut Decius* created a different balance between Roman glory and tragic loss.⁶⁹ The play commemorated the *devotio* of Decius in 295 BC at the battle of Sentinum.⁷⁰ While Accius celebrated this victory's significance, surviving fragments address the emotional difficulties of victory achieved at the cost of Roman life. One fragment preserves a command to avenge previously spilt Roman blood with Gallic slaughter (*vim Gallicam obduc contra in acie exercitum, / lue patrum hostili fuso sanguen sanguine*).⁷¹ This focus on vengeance for a previous generation's crimes—emphasized by the emotive piling up of *sanguen* and *sanguine*—recalls motivations central to revenge tragedies. Moreover, when Decius invoked the exemplum of his father (*quibu' rem summam et patriam nostram quondam adauctavit / pater*)⁷² perhaps as he made his suicidal decision (*patrio exemplo a me dicabo atque animam devoro hostibus*), he recalled similar moments of self-sacrifice from Attic tragedy.⁷³ Thus Accius represented Decius in tragic terms even as his death became the catalyst for celebrating Roman triumph.

The tragic coloring of Accius' other *praetexta*, the *Brutus*, is even clearer from two lengthy passages preserved by Cicero. In the first, Tarquinius Superbus recounts a dream portending his imminent fall;⁷⁴ in the second, his soothsayer offers interpretation.⁷⁵ These fragments are embedded within Cicero's wider interpretation of dreams, including an earlier quotation from Ennius' *Alexander*.⁷⁶ As Cicero transitioned from Ennius' myth to Accius' history, he suggested that we "examine closer material" (*sed propria videamus*), and when he turned away from history, he announced a return "to foreign material"

69 On this play's structural and thematic relationship to tragedy, cf. Jocelyn (2000: 341–49); Kragelund (2002: 9).

70 On why Accius chose this battle and the *devotio* of the younger Decius rather than his father, cf. Jocelyn (2000: 341).

71 Acc. Dec. frag. 3 Manuwald (2001: 196, 208–9). Jocelyn (2000: 349–55) explores Accius' reasons for choosing the Gauls as the enemies, rather than any number of combinations of Italian peoples which might have been expected.

72 Acc. Dec. frag. 10 Manuwald (2001: 198 and 216–17).

73 Acc. Dec. frag. 11 Manuwald (2001: 198 and 217–19). Cf. Eur. *Heracl.* 501–502, *IA.* 1375–1376 and 1472–1476, and *Phoen.* 997–998 and 1009–1012 all with Jocelyn (2000: 347–48).

74 Manuwald (2001: 220 with discussion on 222–32). *Brutus* frag. 1 = Cic. *Div.* 1.44.

75 Manuwald (2001: 220–21 with discussion on 222–32). *Brutus* frag. 2 = Cic. *Div.* 1.45. We cannot tell if the two fragments form one contiguous portion of a scene or if something intervened.

76 Cic. *Div.* 1.42. Goldberg (2007: 573) powerfully articulates the need to consider the contexts—i.e. the interpretive framework—in which the fragments of *praetextae* are embedded, especially when that context is itself a literary work with its own rhetorical aims.

(*age nunc externa redeamus*).⁷⁷ These transitional phrases are important: the collective first person expression and the adjective *propiora* implies examples that are closer or more native than myth (even Roman adaptations of myth), suggesting that to Cicero, as to Horace, *praetexta* were more distinctly Roman.⁷⁸

But despite his focus on *propiora*, Accius borrowed the trope of a tyrant's prophetic dream wholesale from tragedy. Moreover, the dream's symbolic ram (*pecus lanigerum eximia pulchritudine*) and solar disruption (*dextorsum orbem flammeum radiatum solis liquier cursu novo*) were likewise stock motifs found, e.g., in the Atreus cycle.⁷⁹ Thus not only in terms of formal characteristics of language, meter, stock scenes and characters, but also in terms of actual content, Tarquin's speech brought Roman history within the realm of tragedy.

Accius modeled these passages on the dream of Atossa in Aeschylus' *Persae*, uniting intertextually Roman and Greek historical drama.⁸⁰ From these allusions, however, differences emerge. Aeschylus put no named Greek characters on stage; instead he examined the royal house's fall from the Persian perspective such that his audience could sympathize with Persian tragedy while celebrating Greek victory.⁸¹ Such geographical and cultural distance, however, was less possible for Accius. Unlike Darius or Xerxes, Tarquin was no foreign *hostis*, but a Roman *rex*. While Tarquin's fall became a celebratory historical event, it nevertheless involved violence between Romans and domestic turmoil. Thus like his predecessor Ennius, Accius used tragic models to explore difficult moments from Rome's past even as those moments yielded to commemorative celebration.

The anonymous seer further underscores the genre's hybridity. After confirming the tragic omens that threaten Tarquin's reign, his tone changed as he turned from warning his king to addressing the Roman people. Through the disruption in the sun's course, he said, the gods portended a Roman revolution (*populo commutationem rerum portendit fore/ perpropinquam*), which he prayed would turn out well for the people, not for Tarquin (*haec bene*

77 Cic. *Div.* 1.43 and 1.46 respectively.

78 Cf. Manuwald (2001: 222) and Petrone (2001: 175) contra Castagna (2002: 84), who reads the *propiora* temporally.

79 Acc. *Brut.* frag. 1 line 4 and frag. 1 lines 11–12 with Manuwald (2001: 220–37). Cf. also Mastrocinque (1983); Manuwald (2001: 229 with n. 258); Castagna (2002: 85–86); Garelli (2007: 154–55); cf. Eur. *El.* 699–745, Eur. *Or.* 996–1010, Sen. *Thy.* 225–235.

80 The connections are well noted: Manuwald (2001: 232) and Erasmo (2004: 59–63). The *Octavia* also seems indebted to Aeschylus' *Persae*: cf. Ferri (2003: 334) and Boyle (2008: 244–45).

81 For the ideological complexities of Aeschylus' project and its success both in terms of its tragic form and its political aims, cf. Garvie (2009: ix–xxxvi).

verruncent populo!).⁸² Thus as one of tragedy's stock characters shifted his allegiance from king to populace, a tyrant's tragedy became Rome's celebration. While to some this tension demonstrates *praetexta*'s limitations as a coherent, serious genre,⁸³ I suggest that this moment most clearly illustrates the significance of tragedy to Roman historical drama. Through a scene replete with mythological tragedy's formal characteristics and themes, Accius created an innovative dramatic space in which the tragic coexisted with the celebratory.

The evidence from our fragments suggests that celebrations of Roman triumph did not preclude its representation in tragic terms: the fall of a dynasty, the self-sacrifice of a hero, the seeds of discord narrowly averted. Even Rome's most celebratory *praetextae* did not eschew their tragic roots.⁸⁴ Moreover, the Romans themselves seem to have had a wider concept of tragedy's use in celebration than discussions of *praetextae* often allow. In 55 BC at the opening of his theater, Pompey restaged Naevius' *Trojan Horse* and Accius' *Clytemnestra* to reproduce through myth his Eastern triumph of 61 BC.⁸⁵ While Pompey's assimilation of himself to Agamemnon is far from straightforwardly celebratory given the prideful hero's pathetic end, the myth's tragic elements did not undercut the spectacular show. Similarly when Octavian celebrated his triple triumph in 29 BC, he commissioned a *Thyestes*. Octavian's motives for selecting this myth are as irrecoverable as Varius' text, but there seemed to be no contemporary unease over his celebratory use of a tragedy far removed from the so-called panegyric of *praetextae*.⁸⁶

I do not mean to suggest that all Roman historical dramas were tragic. Our fragments of Naevius' *Clastidium*, for example, do not allow us to make such claims and while the anonymous *Nonae Caprotinae* and the *Claudia Quinta* were certainly aetiological, any tragic elements are lost.⁸⁷ Nevertheless, we should remember that plays often considered panegyric today (e.g., the *Ambracia* or *Paulus*) still contained multifaceted tragic elements that add to rather than detract from the genre's success at celebrating Rome's identity. And so while it is inappropriate to strip from Republican *praetextae* their celebratory intention, it is equally damaging to deny them their tragic connections.

82 Acc. *Brut.* frag. 2 lines 7–8 and 8 with Manuwald (2001: 222–32).

83 Petrone (2001: 174–75).

84 Boyle (2006: 12 n. 31) nicely illustrates this point; cf. also Garelli (2007: 155–56).

85 Cf. Cic. *Fam.* 7.1. For various interpretations cf. Goldberg (1996); Beacham (1999: 62–77 and 266–267); Champlin (2003: 295–303); Erasmo (2004: 82–91); Boyle (2006: 150–58); Gildenhard (2010: 169–71).

86 Leigh (1996); Erasmo (2004: 101–11); Boyle (2006: 160–62).

87 Kragelund (2002: 17–27); Flower (2002: 68–72); Wiseman (2002a: 85).

As Rome's most famous celebratory contexts suggest, tragedy and celebration need not be mutually exclusive.

4 Imperial *Praetextae*: Break with Tradition?

"But if *Cato* omitted anything, *Thyestes* will say it in my next recitation; for I have already planned this tragedy and arranged it mentally" (*quod si qua omisit Cato, sequenti recitatione Thyestes dicet; hanc enim tragoediam disposui iam et intra me ipse formavi*).⁸⁸ So exclaimed Tacitus' Maternus to friends who feared that his *Cato* offended powerful men. His fellow interlocutor Aper replied incredulously, wondering what satisfaction can come from adding more Roman subjects to the register of Greekling tragedies ([*ut*] *Domitium et Catonem, id est nostras quoque historias et Romana nomina Graeculorum fabulis adgregares*).⁸⁹ Although *fabulae praetextae* were not Tacitus' prime concern in the *Dialogus*, it has become a key text for the idea that (1) under the empire, *praetexta* became critical of the Principate and (2) in doing so, the genre turned away from its origins and became tragedy in Roman dress.⁹⁰ For this reason some assume that our sole surviving imperial *praetexta*, the *Octavia*, offers little information about Republican antecedents. Nevertheless, now that we have laid groundwork for reexamining Republican *praetextae*'s tragic elements, we ought to reconsider how different their imperial counterparts were.

The anonymous *Octavia*, while focused on the dynastic crisis of AD 62 when Nero divorced, exiled, and executed his wife, was nevertheless cut from the tragic cloth.⁹¹ It has all of tragedy's stock characters: an angry tyrant, vengeful royal women, choruses, nurses, messengers, ghosts, and a family whose criminal past spanned generations. Moreover, Octavia's personal journey from empress of Rome, haunted by her family's bloody past, to disgraced ex-wife executed for a revolution started in her name recalls the tragic ends of mythological heroines.

88 Tac. *Dial.* 3.3.

89 Tac. *Dial.* 3.4.

90 Schmidt (1985) and, contra, Kragelund (2002: 36–41). Boyle (2006: 232–33) notes the significance of the evidence of Tacitus' *Dialogus*, but emphasizes the genre's earlier tragic links.

91 The recent commentaries of Ferri (2003a) and Boyle (2008) trace the structural, linguistic, and thematic connections between Senecan drama and the *Octavia*. Of course, if more Roman drama survived, the poet's dependence on Seneca might not appear so stark.

An important aspect of this tragic patterning also exists at the intertextual level: while certain scenes recalled episodes from Senecan tragedy, Attic drama supplied crucial allusive models.⁹² Within the play's opening scene, Octavia compared her life to Electra's and scholars have traced the patterns of allusion in Octavia to Sophocles' play:⁹³

*O mea nullis aequanda malis
fortuna, licet
repetam luctus, Electra, tuos:
tibi maerenti caesum licuit 60
flere parentem,
scelus ulcisci vindice fratre,
tua quem pietas hosti rapuit
textitque fides.*

Alas for my fortune which cannot be equaled by any evils, although I repeat your grief, Electra: to you at least as you grieved it was permitted to weep for a parent brutally slaughtered, to avenge the crime with your brother as avenger, whom your piety rescued from the enemy and your loyalty protected.

But though Octavia assimilated Claudius with Agamemnon, she emphasized the difference between Electra and herself: Electra protected her brother, while Octavia could only watch hers become the dynasty's next victim. This connection between the Julio-Claudians and the house of Atreus culminated in the play's final scene where the erstwhile empress realized that she had earlier miscast herself; the role she played was Agamemnon's other daughter, Iphigenia, sacrificed on the altar of her father's ambition in a decision that doomed them all.⁹⁴ Through these allusive strategies and adherence to Greek and Roman tragedy's formal characteristics, stock elements, and themes, the *Octavia* poet made manifest the tragic shape of Julio-Claudian history.

92 Cf., e.g., the extensive allusions to Seneca's *Thyestes* and *Phaedra* in the dialogue between Nero and Seneca at *Oct.* 437–592 with Ferri (2003a) and Boyle (2008) ad loc.

93 The text of the *Octavia* is Zwielerlein 1986.

94 *Oct.* 958–982. It has long been noted that Sophocles' *Electra* plays a significant role in the *Octavia*'s reworking of Greek tragic models; cf., e.g., Ladek (1909); Herington (1961); Bellandi (1997). On the echoes of Iphigenia and Antigone in the play's final scene, cf. Ferri (2003a) and Boyle (2008) ad loc.

And yet, does this tragic coloring make the *Octavia* not a *praetexta* by Republican standards? Several scholars have argued for important connections between the *Octavia* and what came before.⁹⁵ We cannot make any distinction on the basis of formal characteristics such as language, metrics, or stock characters as we have seen that *praetextae* typically adhered to contemporary tragedy in this regard. The *Octavia* did break the principle of unity of time and possibly also of place, but such deviations might have been common to *praetexta*.⁹⁶ Moreover the drama's chorus(es) of Roman people actively influenced the plot through revolution, a tradition often assumed to have Republican origins.⁹⁷

As a play of serious tone with high-ranking characters that commemorated a politically important event, the *Octavia* also adhered to the basic intent of Republican *praetexta*. Despite its gloominess, the *Octavia* might even have carried over from the Republic the genre's celebratory nature. For in watching Octavia's suffering and in re-experiencing Nero's tyranny, the play's post AD 68 Roman audience could have rejoiced in Nero's subsequent death and the restoration of his victims to public memory.⁹⁸ Against this reading stands the play's haunting final line, "Rome rejoices in the blood of its citizenry" (*civis gaudet Roma cruore*), which suggested that Nero's reign was but one iteration of Roman strife.⁹⁹ Yet Republican *praetextae* like Ennius' *Sabinae* show us that playwrights balanced well celebratory contexts with tragic themes. The *Octavia* dramatized in tragic terms the suffering of those closest to Nero, but it simultaneously participated in the reimagining of Nero at a time when his

95 The best summary of the issue is Kragelund (2002: 41–51) who argues for shared characteristics between the *Octavia* and Republican *praetextae*.

96 Cf. above p. 226.

97 Cf. above n. 49. Ascertaining the identity of the *Octavia*'s two choruses presents considerable difficulty, nor is there space here to fully treat the issue. The first chorus (273–376 and 669–689) is clearly made up of Roman citizens, but the identity of the second chorus (762–819)—and indeed even the lines that should be attributed to it (e.g. 877–898)—remains up for debate. Although Wiseman (2001 and 2002b) and others argue for a primary chorus of citizens and a minor course of courtiers who support Poppaea, I follow Smith (2003) who sees two choruses of rival citizens in tension. Nevertheless, I do not think Manuwald's (2001: 292–96) distinction between a '*praetexta* chorus' and a 'tragic chorus' is necessary.

98 Wiseman (2001) and (2002); Kragelund (1998: 506 with n. 64) and (2005); Flower (2006: 202–9). The ancient tradition placed Nero's suicide on the same date as Octavia's execution (Suet. *Ner.* 46.1), further connecting the two events in cultural memory.

99 Oct. 982. Sullivan (1985: 72); Smith (2003: 425 and 430); Harrison (2003: 119).

demise became an event worth celebrating.¹⁰⁰ It is this balance between tragic form and celebratory intent that *praetextae* of the Republic often manipulated to artistic effect.

What does this mean for other imperial *praetextae*? We can begin with Maternus' *Cato*, the structure of which is easily imagined. It would likely have culminated in Cato's defiant yet patriotic suicide at Utica after which he became a symbol for Rome's 'true' citizens. Accius' *Decius* suggests fruitful comparisons: each play commemorated a patriot's self-sacrifice *pro patria* and asked its audience to live up to this exemplum. Maternus' *Domitius*, if focused on the consul of 54 BC, would have suggested a similar message if the finale focused on the man's noble death at the hands of Caesarean enemies.¹⁰¹ Though one was written at *praetexta*'s height in the Republic and the other two in the genre's final moments under the empire, these three plays likely shared important structural and thematic parallels through which the exemplary death of a Roman hero inspired men to keep fighting for Rome.

This comparison, of course, glosses over the criticism that Tacitus' Maternus meant his dramas (historical and mythological) to convey. And thus within a genre whose formal characteristics, plots, and tone connected it to the tragic tradition, we see an important shift in message.¹⁰² Nevertheless, this too suggests that *praetextae* developed under the empire in dialogue with mythological tragedy just as they did in the Republic, for while Augustus could celebrate Actium with a commissioned *Thyestes*, Maternus' play of the same name must be of a different sort. Although the message has changed, no one would suggest that one was not tragedy. Like most genres of Roman poetry, *praetextae* underwent shifts in message, formal characteristics, performance contexts, and reception under the empire. But while scholars are correct in seeing a pervasive tragic character within the few imperial *praetextae* for which we have evidence, I suggest that this tragic character was part of the genre all along.

100 Flower (2006: 202–9).

101 Tac. *Dial.* 3.4. Kragelund (2002: 38–41 with n. 101). I leave aside the fraught question of whether Tacitus indicates that Maternus wrote a *Nero* as well.

102 "If this surmise is correct, what changed in the empire was not the *nature* of *praetextae* so much as the *circumstance* of their delivery." (Harrison [2003] 114–15). I would add that the intent and even reception of the genre may have shifted without divorcing it from its Republican roots. Under the empire, to celebrate the Republic as it had been celebrated in the past became itself a form of dissent and double speak.

5 Conclusion: The Legacy of Accius' *Brutus*

In the year 44 BC, Marcus Junius Brutus planned to restage Accius' *Brutus* at the *Ludi Apollinares*.¹⁰³ He likely hoped that through a *praetexta* on his legendary ancestor he could influence the reception of Caesar's assassination. Cicero had benefited from a partial restaging of this same play in 57 BC when the actor Aesopus inserted lines from the *Brutus* into a mythological tragedy, turning it into an argument for Cicero's recall.¹⁰⁴ Unfortunately for Brutus, political dangers kept him from Rome and the aedile substituted Accius' *Tereus* instead. And yet in the end this mattered little: the audience expected a political play, and Accius' *Tereus* conveyed Brutus' anti-tyrannical message.¹⁰⁵

This anecdote is significant for multiple reasons. First it shows the longevity a *praetexta* could achieve on the Roman stage, regardless of an aedile's ancestral connection to the play's protagonist. Second, we see how each reperformance awoke new associations and political messages: through one play, Brutus the tyrannicide is connected to Cicero, Callaicus, and Rome's first consul, a veritable pageant of Roman patriots. Finally, it indicates that at two points in its reception Accius' *Brutus* was conflated with mythological tragedy: for Cicero, lines from a *praetexta* found their way into myth, and for Brutus myth was left to convey what a *praetexta* was meant to make manifest. No barriers of performance context, reception, or message stood in the way of this seamless interplay between genres, and while the year 44 BC itself might suggest the beginnings of a shift towards anti-imperial dramas, the plays in question date from the heyday of Republican drama.

As has often been noted, Roman politics are highly theatrical and Roman theater highly political. And within this web of theater, politics, and history a strand of serious drama developed at Rome that could celebrate its achievements without overlooking the tragic elements of that *memoria rerum gestarum*.

103 For Brutus' desire to use Accius' play, cf. App. *BC* 3.23–24; Cic. *Att.* 16.1.1; 16.2.3; 16.4.1; 16.5.1, *Phil.* 1.36 and 10.8.

104 Cic. *Sest.* 120–124.

105 Cic. *Att.* 16.2; Cic. *Phil.* 10.8.

Roman Tragedy and Philosophy

Christopher Star

The study of tragedy and philosophy in the Roman world presents several difficulties. For many today, the great philosophical thinkers and dramatists of the antiquity were Greek. The modern philosophers who have looked to tragedy, from Hegel and Schopenhauer, to Nietzsche and Bernard Williams, have all mined Greek tragedy for insights and inspiration.¹ The Romans would likely not be particularly surprised or bothered by this fact. Both tragedy and philosophy were imports from the Greek world that came to Rome as part of the city's growing political and military domination of the Mediterranean. To many Romans, the acceptance of drama and philosophy ran the risk of corrupting what they saw as their native and superior traditional society. During the middle of the Republican period, Cato the Elder went so far as to say that Rome would lose its empire if it ever allowed Greek literature to become part of its society (Plutarch *Cato Maior* 23.2). In reality, the opposite proved to be true. The more Rome conquered, the more it integrated Greek culture and ideas. As victims of a reverse form of cultural imperialism, the Romans would remain deeply suspicious of both practices.

The 'origin' of tragedy at Rome likely came soon after Rome's victory over Carthage in the First Punic war with a performance of a Greek play translated by the former slave Livius Andronicus in 240 BC for the Roman Games (*Ludi Romani*) honoring Jupiter Optimus Maximus.² Throughout the Republican period, several more festivals were added to the calendar, during which dramas would be performed along with several other forms of entertainment.³ Unlike classical Athens, where tragedies were only staged as part of the yearly competition at the festival of Dionysus each spring, there came to be several opportunities for drama to be performed in Rome, in both public and, particularly

1 Nussbaum (2003: 222–23).

2 We know very little about the life of Livius Andronicus. He was possibly from the southern Italian town of Tarentum, which was originally part of Magna Graecia, but came under Rome's orbit by 272 BC. Andronicus may have come to Rome around this date. He became the freedman of Livius Salinator, hence his Latin *praenomen*. He also translated the *Odyssey* into Latin using the Italic Saturnian meter, and wrote a hymn in celebration of Juno, which is traditionally dated to 207 BC. Only a few fragments of his compositions survive.

3 For example, soon after the *Ludi Romani*, festivals celebrating Apollo (*Ludi Apollinares* 212 BC) and the Great Mother, Cybele (*Ludi Megalenses* 204 BC), were added.

during the imperial period, in private settings. Also unlike Athens, where the Theater of Dionysus was a central part of the civic landscape, for most of the Republican period, the Roman authorities insured that drama could only be performed on temporary stages, and would even halt and tear down attempts at building stone theaters.⁴ The first permanent theater in Rome, the Theater of Pompey, was not built until 55 BC. Actors as well were stigmatized. In 115 BC, “theatrical personnel” were expelled from the city.⁵ Citizens generally were not professional actors (Livy 7.2). This prejudice continued well into the imperial period. Seneca calls on his readers to remember that the man who struts about the stage claiming to be king of Argos is in fact a slave (*Epistulae morales* 80.7–8). Pliny the Younger, in his panegyric for Trajan, insultingly calls Nero the “actor emperor” (Pliny *Panegyricus* 46.4).

During the Republican period, perhaps no military victory contributed more to the cultural development of Rome than the defeat of Perseus, king of Macedonia, by the Roman general Lucius Aemilius Paullus in 168 BC. This event brought the wealth of the Greek world to Rome and also led to an influx of Greek intellectuals into the city. Some, such as the historian Polybius, came as hostages; others, such as the Stoic philosopher Panaetius of Rhodes, came by choice. Nevertheless, there remained a strong anti-Hellenic sentiment, which has come to be personified in the figure of Cato the Elder. In 155 BC, after being ordered to pay a heavy fine for attacking the neighboring city of Oropus, the Athenians sent an embassy of philosophers to Rome in order to appeal the sentence. While the youth of Rome relished the opportunity to listen to these eminent philosophers lecture—the Athenians sent the heads of three schools, the Academic Carneades, the Stoic Diogenes of Babylon and the Peripatetic Critolaus—Cato the Elder put a motion before the Senate to have the philosophers expelled from the city (Plutarch *Cato Maior* 22.5).⁶ Although Cato’s hostility did not keep Greek philosophers and their ideas from influencing Romans, it would take nearly one hundred years for Romans to start writing philosophy in Latin. Lucretius’s magisterial Epicurean poem, *De rerum natura*, and Cicero’s first forays into philosophy, *De re publica* and *De legibus*, date from the 50s BC.⁷ After these two, only Seneca wrote philosophy in Latin during the classical period.

4 Boyle (2006: 109).

5 Boyle (2006: 111).

6 See the discussion of Morford (2002: 19–20). Aulus Gellius (*NA* 15.11) discusses several instances in which philosophers were expelled from Rome.

7 On the development of Roman philosophical writing during the Republic, cf. Rawson (1985: 282–97).

Thus, the study of Roman tragedy and philosophy has been impeded by several factors, the first of which originated with the Romans themselves. Drama, and to a lesser extent philosophy, were important parts of Roman society from the middle Republican period on, but at the same time, the Romans saw both practices as foreign and even detrimental to their political and military mission. The second problem stems from the more recent history of the reception of Roman drama and philosophy. While both were central to the development of the culture of the Renaissance and early modern period, their influence and prestige dropped precipitously during the 19th century. Until recently, Roman tragedy and philosophy were generally seen as unoriginal and unworthy shadows of their Greek predecessors. This view is changing, but readers who wish to undertake a serious investigation of Roman tragedy on any level are hindered by the simple fact that very little of Roman tragedy has survived. We have only fragments of the Republican tradition and virtually nothing from the imperial period, save for the plays by Seneca and the two attached to his name. Finally, we must address the serious question of the critical viability of reading tragedy and philosophy together.⁸ Does this method of investigation run the risk of ignoring the aesthetic elements of tragedy and reducing them to mere didactic lessons? What is to be gained by reading the two in tandem?

In general, it would seem that the relationship between philosophy and tragedy has been one sided. Philosophy has been greatly enriched by its consideration of tragedy. Cicero and Seneca, like Plato and Aristotle before them, use passages from tragedy and other poetic genres as part of their philosophical argument.⁹ The evidence for influence in the other direction is considerably more difficult to pin down. Indeed, the world of suffering, emotion and vulnerability that tragedy presents seems to run counter to the ideals of calm self-sufficiency that many schools of ancient philosophy advocate. This apparent radical disjunction between tragedy and philosophy is particularly problematic for the study of the Seneca. Rather than harmonizing the two worlds as that *rara avis*, a philosopher and a tragedian, Seneca does not make explicit the connection between his two bodies of work. Efforts to explicate the link between Senecan philosophy and tragedy started soon after his death. The

8 For an overview of the question of the relationship between drama and philosophy, cf. Zamir (2007) and Puchner (2010).

9 Perhaps Plato's most famous discussions of poetry come in the *Ion* and *Republic* (386a–394e, 595a–608b). Aristotle's *Poetics* may take up Plato's challenge in the *Republic* (607d) to demonstrate how poetry, and tragedy in particular, does not simply provide pleasure, but can benefit the individual and society. We will consider a number of examples of Cicero's and Seneca's discussions of tragedy below.

anonymous authors of *Hercules Oetaeus* and the historical drama *Octavia* each provide their own readings of Seneca. Given the nature of what remains of Roman tragedy, philosophy, in particular Senecan philosophy, is one of its key intertexts. Seneca did not start this trend, however. As we shall see, early Roman drama engaged with philosophy, and eventually, in the works of Cicero and Seneca, the investigation would also flow in the other direction.

In this chapter we will address the question of Roman tragedy and philosophy chronologically from Republican drama to the final surviving works from the early Empire. This study will cover over three hundred years of Roman history and two forms of government, republic and autocracy. As we look at the earliest examples, we will see that Roman playwrights paradoxically used one suspect Greek import to test and define the place in Roman society of another, that was equally, if not more, suspect. As we progress, we will focus on how Roman tragedy and philosophy engage with the politics of tyranny and the psychology of the passions. In order to demonstrate an aspect of continuity across tragedy and philosophy from both the Republic and Empire, this chapter concludes with an investigation of the reception of the famous words spoken by the Republican tragedian Accius's (c. 170 BC–c. 85 BC) Atreus, "Let them hate, provided that they fear" (*oderint, 203 R³; 168 W*).¹⁰

Due to the relative paucity of examples that have survived from Republican tragedy, we must be careful when judging how prevalent philosophical ideas may have been. It must also be remembered that Cicero preserves many passages in his own philosophical works and this fact likely affects the content of the passages we have. Nevertheless, it is clear that the Romans used drama to voice their concerns about the growing influence of Greek intellectualism in their culture. This phenomenon is seen in both Roman tragedy and comedy. In Plautus's (c. 255 BC–184 BC) *Rudens*, Gripus notes that although comedies try to teach people the "ways of the wise man" (*illos sapientis mores*), their advice is never heeded (1249–1253). In several of Plautus's plays, Latinized versions of the Greek words for "philosopher" and "to philosophize" (*philosophus* and *philosophari*) are not employed in a positive sense, but rather refer to mendacious and dangerously clever intelligence.¹¹

When we turn to Ennius (c. 239 BC–169 BC), we see further probing and testing of the place of philosophy in the Roman world. In his epic poem on Roman history, the *Annales*, Ennius proudly connects himself to the Greek tradition of poetry and wisdom (*sophia and sapientia*, 206–208, 211–212 Skutsch; 229–230,

10 All translations are my own.

11 Petrone (1992: 51–57). Cf. Plaut. *Ps.* 687, 974; *Merc.* 142; *Capt.* 282–284.

232–234 W). In his tragedies, however, Ennius is more circumspect. A fragment spoken by Achilles's son, Neoptolemus, sets a clear boundary on the place and value of philosophy: "It is necessary for me to philosophize, briefly; for to do so fully is not at all pleasing" (*philosophandum est, paucis, nam omnino haud placet*, 147 TrRF; 340 R³; 400 W). This sentiment would seem to support the stereotype of Romans as generally distrustful and even disdainful of philosophy. Indeed, it might be seen as a motto for many learned Romans who wished to understand the tenets of the various Greek philosophical schools that were flooding their culture, but did not wish to surrender to them. Another fragment from Ennius speaks to the Romans' belief that wisdom should not be sought for its own sake, but must have practical use. His *Medea* contains the maxim, "The wise man who does not benefit himself is wise in vain" (*qui ipse sibi sapiens prodesse non quit, nequiquam sapit*, 90 TrRF; 240 R³; 271 W).

Ennius's prescriptions for the role of philosophy did not prevent him from being cited by Roman philosophers, however. To take but a few examples from the plethora of passages from Republican dramatists that can be found throughout his oratory and philosophy, Cicero cites passages from several of Ennius's tragedies when discussing different theories of and cures for the emotions in book three of his *Tusculan Disputations*. Cicero looks to Ennius to buttress his claim that diseases of the soul are more serious than those of the body: "A sick soul is always wandering; it can neither endure nor bear up, it never ceases to desire" (*animus aeger semper errat; / neque pati neque perpeti potest, cupere numquam desinit*, 156 TrRF; 360 R³; 408–408 W = Cic. *Tusc.* 3.5). Cicero quotes laments from Ennius's *Andromacha* to illustrate his claim that Epicurean remedies are useless for alleviating extreme sorrow and grief (157.23 TrRF; 89, 75–80, 81–88 R³; 363–365, 94–108 W = Cic. *Tusc.* 3.44–45). Seneca does not cite Republican tragedy nearly as often as Cicero. To help alleviate Polybius's sorrow at the death of his brother, he marshals a line from an unknown play, spoken bravely by a father after his son's death had been reported, "When I begot him, I knew then he was going to die" (*ego cum genui, tum moriturum scivi*, 58 TrRF *adespota*; 85–87 R³ *incert. incert.*; 319 W *Ennius Telamo* = Seneca *CO**nsolatio ad Polybium* 11.2).¹² Although he wrote his famous philosophical *Meditations* in Greek, the future emperor Marcus Aurelius read Ennius while a student. In his Latin correspondence with his teacher Fronto, Marcus cites two maxims likely from Ennius's tragedies, "Conquer with steadfast steadfastness" (*pervince pertinaci pervicacia*, 182 TrRF; 488 R³; 401 W) and,

12 Cf. also Seneca's (mostly negative) evaluations of Ennius from the 22nd book of his letters, preserved by Aulus Gellius (*NA* 12.2.2).

“They all give empty counsel and do everything in order to please” (*omnes dant consilium vanum atque ad voluptatem omnia*; 181 TrRF; 407 R³; 404 W).

If Plautus and Ennius offer us a glimpse of how the Romans during the middle Republic first began to use drama to think through the place of philosophy in their society, the surviving works of Ennius's nephew Marcus Pacuvius demonstrate how quickly and deeply these new Greek ideas were absorbed. Born in Brindisium, Pacuvius (c. 220 BC–130 BC), like his uncle, was originally from the Hellenized world of southern Italy, but Pacuvius is said to have gained a level of financial independence and social status not achieved by his fellow playwrights, which may have contributed to his innovatively intellectual tragedies.¹³ One long passage to survive from Pacuvius's *Chryses* discusses the nature of the earth and the heavens (90 R³; 110–115 W; 80 Schierl):

hoc vide, circum supraque quod complexu continet terram
solisque exortu capessit candorem, occasu nigret,
id quod nostri caelum memorant, Grai perhibent aethera:
quidquid est hoc, omnia animat format alit auget creat
sepelit recipitque in sese omnia, omniumque idem est pater,
indidemque eadem aequae oriuntur de integro atque eodem occidunt.

mater terrast: parit haec corpus, animam <autem> aeter adiungat.

Look at this, which around and above holds the earth in its embrace,
and holds the brightness of the sun at its rising, and grows dark at its
setting,
that which our people name the sky, the Greeks call the aether:
whatever this is, it gives life to all things, shapes, nourishes, increases,
creates them,
buries and receives everything into itself, and it is the father of
everything,
and from the same origin the same things equally are born anew and
to the same place fall away.

The earth is our mother: it produces our body, and the aether adds our
soul.

13 Boyle (2006: 88).

This fragment is developed from Euripides's *Chrysippus* (TrGF 836), but Pacuvius includes his own explanatory addition.¹⁴ Referencing the original Greek, Pacuvius demonstrates how to render the Greek word for "heavens" (*aethera*) into Latin (*caelum*). Although originally a Greek passage spoken by a Greek character in Euripides, the everyday language of the Roman community (*nostrī*) is contrasted with the terminology used by the 'Greeks' (*Graī*). In this way, Pacuvius not only offers his audience a lengthy piece of natural philosophy, but also a brief lesson in translation from Greek to Latin. In fact, this is one of the earliest attested uses of *aether* in Latin.

A fragment from an unknown play presents the different opinions of philosophers on the nature of Fortune. As scholars have pointed out, the explicit mention of *philosophi*, strongly suggests that this passage is not based on a Greek original.¹⁵ Thus, this fragment may represent the earliest recorded original discussion of philosophy in Latin (370 R³; 37–46 W unassigned fragments):

Fortunam insanam esse et caecam et brutam perhibent philosophi,
 saxoque instare in globoso praedicant volubilei,
 id quo saxum inpulerit fors, eo cadere Fortunam autumant.
 Insanam autem esse aiunt quia atrox incerta instabilisque sit;
 caecam ob eam rem esse iterant quia nil cernat quo sese adplicet;
 brutam quia dignum atque indignum nequeat internoscere.
 Sunt autem alii philosophi qui contra Fortuna negant
 ullam miseriam esse, temeritatem autumant.
 id magis verisimile esse usus reapse experiundo edocet;
 velut Orestes modo fuit rex, factust mendicus modo.

The philosophers say that Fortune is outrageous, blind and insensible,
 and they declare that she stands on a rolling ball,
 wherever chance pushes the rock, there, they assert, Fortune falls.
 They say she is outrageous because she is savage and unsteady and
 instable;
 they repeat that she is blind because she does not see at all where she
 directs herself;
 insensible because she cannot discern the worthy from the unworthy.
 There are, however, other philosophers who deny that Fortune is
 the cause of any misery, but believe that accident is everything.

14 Cf. also Lucretius 2.991–1009.

15 Cancik (1978: 334) and Boyle (2006: 90).

Practical Experience teaches that this in fact is true;
just as Orestes was once a king, now he has become a beggar.¹⁶

The two concepts of *Fortuna* appear to be generally based on Stoic and Epicurean ideas.¹⁷ The Stoics taught their followers to be impervious to the blows of blind Fortune; the Epicureans sought a naturalistic, rather than divine, explanation for all events. The detail of explication in this fragment is remarkable. The repetition of *quia* ("because") gives the feeling of a teacher lecturing before students and suggests something of the intellectual atmosphere at Rome. Members of the elite watched as the ideas they studied were dramatized on stage, and may have been surprised to see Epicureanism supported so strongly. For others, such moments in drama may have provided their only significant exposure to philosophical debate. Nevertheless, Pacuvius's plays do not uncritically embrace philosophy. One passage treats philosophers with suspicion, "I hate men characterized by cowardly deeds and philosophical opinions" (*odi ego homines ignava opera et philosopha sententia*, 348 R³ *Teucer*; 11 W *incert. incert.*; 4 Schierl *incert. fab.*). Writing during the imperial period, Aulus Gellius, who preserves this passage, states that his philosopher friend Macedo believes that this line should be written over the doors of every temple (*Noctes Atticae* 13.8.4). Gellius concludes by decrying that many people adopt the appearance of philosophers when they are in fact riddled with every vice. Pacuvius's warning about base men preaching philosophy would later become an important topic for both Cicero and Seneca as well as for Roman satirists.¹⁸

Another significant and influential aspect of Pacuvius's dramas is their focus on psychology. The fragments of his *Periboea* preserve a soliloquy in which Diomedes addresses his soul and his mind (385 R³; 305–307; 211 Schierl):

Consternare, anime? ex pectore aude evolvere
consilium subito, mens, quod enatumst modo,
qui pacto inimicis mortem et huic vitam afferas.

Are you afraid my soul? Dare to unfold from your breast
the plan, my mind, which has now been born suddenly,
in which way you might bring death to enemies and life to this man.

16 Some editors add the final line, "by shipwreck; for it was caused by the sea, not by chance or Fortune" (*naufragio. nempe ergo id fluctu, haud Forte aut Fortuna obtigit*).

17 Boyle (2006: 90–91).

18 Bartsch (2006: 164–82).

As Boyle points out, this passage represents “the first extant undeniable soliloquy of Roman tragedy.”¹⁹ This mode of self-exhortation and self-command given to the soul (*anime*) is one of the hallmarks of Senecan tragedy.²⁰ Yet, as we shall see further below, Seneca provides his own problematic twist. Several of his characters, most notably Atreus, Medea, Clytemnestra and Phaedra, use self-address in order to urge themselves on to perform criminal acts and take the figure of self-address down a new and dark path.

Seneca was not the first to consider how reason may paradoxically be used in the service of vice and the passions, however. Already in the Republican period, Cicero saw how Roman tragedy questioned the Stoic link between the exercise of reason and that of virtue. In the unfortunately badly damaged and fragmentary book three of *De natura deorum*, Cotta, Cicero’s spokesperson for academic skepticism, discusses how versions of *Medea* and Accius’s *Atreus* link crimes with reason. Arguing against the Stoic belief that reason is an unequivocally good gift from the gods, Cotta quotes passages from the *Medea* of Ennius and a version by an unknown author in order to demonstrate how “for Medea crime and reason were not lacking” (*huic ut scelus sic ne ratio quidem defuit* 3.68). About Atreus, Cotta states, “What of that man who prepared a deadly feast for his brother, does he not turn his reason this way and that in his thoughts” (*quid ille funestas epulas fratri comparans none versat huc et illuc cogitatione rationem?* 3.38) He notes that in this play Thyestes also demonstrates that the greatest of crimes makes use of the greatest rationality (*videturne summa improbitate usus non sine summa esse ratione?* 3.69). Cicero notes that Medea, Thyestes and Atreus are not irrational agents, but rather the crimes they commit are calculated and the product of human reason. Cicero uses Roman tragedy to challenge the Stoic idealization of reason, and questions the dichotomy they set up between reason and virtue and the passions and vice. Perhaps Seneca took Cicero’s use of Roman tragedy to critique Stoic truisms as a challenge. Indeed, many of Seneca’s characters seem to be an exercise in working through Cicero’s point about the performance of crime and the use of reason.

The extent to which Seneca’s tragedies relate to Stoicism remains a matter of considerable debate and has resulted in a full spectrum of answers throughout the ages.²¹ Indeed, these two bodies of work can seem so contradictory and irreconcilable that by late antiquity the poet Sidonius Apollinaris believed there to be two Senecas, one who wrote tragedy and the other

19 Boyle (2006: 90).

20 Cf. Tarrant (1976: 194–95).

21 Cf. Dingel (1974: 11–14), Rosenmeyer (1989: 3–11), and Ker (2009: 128–29).

philosophy (*Carmen* 9.232–236). Modern critics do not have the luxury of adopting Sidonius's neat solution. While they have moved away from the extreme and mutually incompatible claims that Seneca's plays intend to teach Stoic doctrine or that they negate it, the content of Seneca's plays, with their portrayal of a world in which vice, vengeance and the passions reign supreme, offers a powerful challenge to the ideals of Stoicism advocated in Seneca's prose works.²² Seneca could have satisfied his desire to be a poet and engage with tragedy in a manner more consistent with the practices of earlier Stoics. The Greek Stoics wrote poetry that advocated for their doctrines, such as Cleanthes's *Hymn to Zeus*, part of which Seneca translated (*Epistulae morales* 107.11). Seneca cites with approval Cleanthes's statement that poetry can present philosophical messages more clearly than prose (*Epistulae morales* 108.8). Instead of writing tragedies, the Stoics often critiqued existing ones. The early Stoic Chrysippus apparently wrote such a detailed exegesis of Euripides's *Medea* that he nearly copied out the entire play (Diogenes Laertius 7.180). Seneca's younger contemporary, Epictetus, discusses how Medea's anger and vengeance could have been prevented (*Discourses* 1.28.7–9; 2.17.19–22). He also succinctly sets out his own view of the genre, "What else is tragedy than the suffering of humans, who are wonderstruck by externals, set out in the usual meter" (*Discourses* 1.4.26).

Seneca chose the much more philosophically dangerous path of writing tragedies. In fact, his plays provide us with few, if any, examples of characters living a model Stoic life. Hercules is a hubristic and megalomaniacal "hero," who, albeit unknowingly, murders his own children. Medea declares that she takes great pleasure in her act of infanticide. Atreus sees killing his brother's sons as the only way to live up to his self-image as a tyrant. Oedipus is guilt-ridden and cringing with fear. Perhaps Seneca's characters are to be seen as negative exemplars, who do not understand Stoic truths; but Stoic ideals are frequently presented as easily overridden platitudes spoken by subservient characters such as Atreus's Minister and Medea's and Phaedra's Nurses. The Chorus has been seen as a guide to a Stoic interpretation of the play.²³ It often points out the need for living a humble life (*Hercules furens* 192–201; *Phaedra* 1123–1127), or the true nature of kingship (*Thyestes* 344–403). Yet the chorus can be entirely unaware of the evil the play's characters are plotting (*Thyestes* 546–595). When the play's horrors are fully revealed, the Chorus can be filled with apocalyptic despair (*Phaedra* 978–988; *Thyestes* 789–884).

22 Marthi (1945: 219) argues that Seneca composed "philosophical propaganda plays." In contrast, Dingel (1974: 14) argues that Seneca's plays reject his philosophy.

23 Nussbaum (1993: 148).

Examples of Stoic fortitude are seen only briefly in the deaths of minor characters. Thyestes's oldest son stands firm and unconcerned for himself as his uncle prepares to butcher him and his two brothers (*Thyestes* 720–721). In the *Troades*, Astyanax's and Polyxena's brave deaths are admired by the Greek spectators (1064, 1098–1099, 1146). Yet in the case of Polyxena's death, this apparent moment of Stoic self-control is undermined. She does not die without emotion, but falls downward onto Achilles's tomb "with angry force" (*prona et irato impetu* 1159).

More problematic is the fact that, echoing Cicero's analysis of Republican plays, several of Seneca's characters appear to adopt Stoic ideas in order to carry out their crimes. As Christopher Gill has demonstrated, in contrast to the representation of madness in Greek tragedy, Seneca's Medea and Phaedra rationally surrender to their passions.²⁴ This point fits well into the Stoic theory of a fully rational soul.²⁵ The Stoics did not believe that passions are the result of an irrational part of the soul taking over the rational. Rather, they argued that the passions occur from judgment and willful disobedience to reason. The passions are an "excessive impulse" that is the result of false beliefs and judgments about the value of external things.²⁶ Thus, Seneca's characters are typically not raving with madness or unaware of the actions that they have committed. Hercules is an important exception, however. He suffers from a more traditional, divinely sent "Greek-type madness." Seneca's *Hercules* opens with Juno plotting to drive her enemy mad. Hercules then kills his family while in a hallucinatory state (939–1038). When he awakens, he does not know where he is or have any recollection of the crimes he committed. Nevertheless, Juno's anger is likely only one of the causes of Hercules's madness. His relentless and overreaching pursuit of heroism may also be a contributing factor.

With the exceptions of Hercules, and to a different extent Oedipus in his eponymous play, a defining aspect of many of Seneca's plays is that his characters are fully aware of their crimes. The desire to outdo the horrors of the past drives Aegisthus, Clytemnestra, Medea, Atreus and Oedipus in the *Phoenissae*. This does not mean, however, that Seneca does not problematize the origins of his characters' actions. For example, Phaedra sees herself as a victim of Venus's hatred of her family (112–128), fights against her emotions and is ready to kill

24 Gill (1997: 215–28).

25 A Stoic theory of psychological dualism was espoused by Posidonius, but this theory did not influence Seneca, who follows the older theory of a unified and fully rational soul set forth by Chrysippus; cp. Inwood (1993: 150–183) and also Gill (1997: 227).

26 On the Stoic view of the passions, cf. Seneca *De ira* 2.1.1–2.4.2, and the key passages collected in Long and Sedley (1987: 65 A–X).

herself rather than act on them (250–254). Once her nurse agrees to help and Phaedra is alone with Hippolytus, however, she urges herself to confess her love (592–600). Although *Thyestes* opens with a Fury driving the initially reluctant ghost of Tantalus to infect his ancestral house with madness and set the play in motion, these infernal powers do not affect Atreus with the blinding madness that is sent to Hercules. Atreus must develop the plan for himself, thus leaving it ambiguous whether his revenge ultimately springs from the Fury and from his cursed family line, or is a product of his own rational self-shaping and dramaturgy.²⁷ Indeed, Atreus's plotting not only complicates the general question of external and internal motivation and responsibility, but also demonstrates Seneca's engagement with his own philosophy as well as the literary tradition.

Before we look closer at the possible links between Seneca's philosophy and tragedy, still more pitfalls must be addressed. The dating of Seneca's works is a notoriously difficult problem. While the relative chronology of his prose works can be established, we cannot be certain when Seneca wrote his plays. Scholars generally accept that his plays can be grouped into three periods: an early one, comprising *Agamemnon*, *Phaedra* and *Oedipus*, which were possibly written during Seneca's exile (41–49 AD), or soon after his return; a middle period, comprising *Troades*, *Medea* and *Hercules*, possibly written during Seneca's early years at the royal court and before Claudius's death in 54 AD; and the final group, consisting of *Thyestes* and the possibly unfinished *Phoenissae*, which date to the 60s, and perhaps to the period after Seneca's retirement in 62 AD. Given the lack of certain dates for Seneca's plays, and the fact that he does not mention them in his philosophy, we must be cautious when discussing how the two relate to each other. Yet it does seem fair to posit that Seneca remained interested in several problems throughout his life, such as tyranny and the passions, and that he treated them from various angles in both prose and poetry. Our analysis below will focus on *Thyestes*. Because it may represent the culmination of Seneca's tragic output, we can feel relatively safe in considering how it looks at two works from earlier in his career, *De clementia*, written at the start of Nero's reign, and *De ira*, likely written during Seneca's exile.²⁸

Atreus opens his monologue declaring himself to be a tyrant (*Thyestes* 177). This designation marks a connection to *De clementia* in which Seneca focuses

27 Similar questions can also be asked of the opening of *Agamemnon*, which begins with the ghost of Thyestes urging his son on to vengeance, but both Clytemnestra and Aegisthus must also urge themselves on as well.

28 For an overview of the problems surrounding the dating of Seneca's works, cf. Marshall (2014: 33–44).

on describing the characteristics of the tyrant and differentiating them from the good king (1.11.4–1.13.5). In this treatise Seneca argues that the tyrant lives a miserable and ultimately short-lived existence. The proudly self-described tyrant in Seneca's play is never challenged, however. The populace, who Seneca states in *De clementia* (1.8.6–7) will inevitably overthrow the tyrant, is entirely absent from *Thyestes*. Rather than being defeated by his own bestial cruelty, Atreus concludes the drama fashioning himself into a divinity. Atreus sacrifices his brother's children to himself (691–714). He declares that he walks equal to the stars (885) and has sent the Olympian gods away (888).²⁹ As he witnesses his brother's drunken feasting, Atreus declares himself to be "the highest of the gods and the king of kings" (*o me caelitem excelsissimum, / regumque regem!* 911–912). Although Atreus also says that he has surpassed his wishes (*vota transcendendi mea* 912), by the play's conclusion, he later reveals that he is not satisfied. Despite the cruelty of his brother's punishment, Atreus laments he has not fully appeased his *ira* (1056–1057) and his *dolor* (1066). He imagines how he could have exacted his revenge in an even more horrific manner (1053–1068). While the play ends with Atreus's supremacy firmly established, his creativity for cruelty knows no bounds. Atreus's power over his brother is clear; but Atreus's ultimate power over his emotions remains a question.

Atreus embraces being a tyrant, but he also realizes that he is not living up to this designation: he has been wronged and has not exacted revenge (176–180). Despite all of his brother's crimes, Atreus is simply angry (*iratus* 180). This connection between anger and revenge references a central point of Seneca's *De ira*. Here again Atreus's words challenge the tenets of Seneca's philosophy. On a general level, this dialogue seeks to cure anger by denying that it is right to seek retribution when motivated by the passions. This is, of course, precisely what Atreus does. On a more technical level, in *De ira*, Seneca argues that the perception and judgment that one has been wronged leads to anger (2.1.3–4). Once the judgment has been made that one has been wronged and one believes it is right to react, anger drives out reason. One is driven to seek vengeance no matter what (2.4.1–2). Once the emotion takes root, people are driven on without concern for their own safety; so Atreus wants revenge even if it means his own destruction (190–191). Yet Atreus's anger does not simply follow the precepts set out in Seneca's treatise. Atreus questions the immediate link between judgment, anger and vengeance. He enters the play complaining that he is merely angry and then engages in monologues and discussions with his minister about how to transform his anger into action. In addition, throughout the development of his plot, Atreus frequently addresses and commands

29 On how Atreus is at once a man, a beast and a god, cf. Davis (2003: 53–57).

his *animus* ("Come, my soul, do what posterity will not approve of, but will not be silent about"; *age, anime, fac quod nulla posteritas probet, / sed nulla taceat* 192–193; see also 270; 283–286). As is the case with many of Seneca's characters, being in the grips of emotion is not enough to ensure that Atreus acts. He paradoxically must maintain and control his anger.

As we have seen, this form of self-apostrophe and self-command is a trope Seneca inherited from his Republican forebearer Pacuvius. This figure also references a Greek tradition of self-address that stretches back to Homer. Aristophanes found it to be such a common and defining feature of Euripides's plays that he mercilessly parodies it in the *Acharnians* (450–453; 480–488). While Aristophanes found self-address to be laughable, Plato had a different opinion of the significance of this trope. He interprets Odysseus's self-address and self-command to his heart (*Odyssey* 20.27–28) as illustrating his theory of the tripartite soul (*Respublica* 441b; see also 390d). In his philosophy, Seneca frequently discusses the value of self-address as a method of therapy for the passions and as a means of self-shaping.³⁰ Furthermore, as Inwood has demonstrated, self-directed commands are an integral part of Seneca's discussions of volition and represent a defining moment for ascribing intentionality.³¹ Needless to say, in Seneca's philosophy self-command is presented in the context of virtue and the performance of right actions.³² In his tragedies, however, Seneca inverts this ideal. In order to commit their crimes, his characters frequently command themselves to stir up their passions, rather than extirpate them.

At the same time, Atreus's self-exhortation looks to the literary tradition. Atreus wants his crimes to be remembered and spoken of by posterity (192–193). He then tells himself that his revenge will only be worthy if it surpasses the crimes done to him (195–196). This theme of outdoing the horrors of the past is, as Henderson remarks about Lucan's programmatic statement at the start of the *Civil War*, indicative of the post-classical aesthetic.³³ As Lucan opens his epic stating that he will sing of "wars greater than civil wars" (*bella . . . plus quam civilia* 1.1), so Seneca's Atreus admits that the plan for revenge that is taking

30 Star (2012: 30–36 and 44–52).

31 Inwood (2000: 53–55).

32 As Inwood points out (2000: 52–55), the difference between allowing oneself to feel emotion and ordering oneself to do so is a theme that can be found throughout Seneca's writings, from his *Consolatio ad Marciam* (8.3), which is likely his earliest surviving work, to his letters, which date from the end of his life (e.g. *Epistulae morales* 116.1). For a list of passages, cf. Inwood (2000: 53 n. 43, and 54 n. 44).

33 Henderson (1998: 165–211).

shape in his soul is “something greater and larger than normal” (*nescioquid animus maius et solito amplius* 267). His *dolor* requires “something greater” (*maius* 274) than crimes of the past, specifically, the cannibalistic feast of Procne, Philomela and Tereus, to which he allusively refers to as “the criminal feasts of the Odrysian house” (*infandas domus / Odrysia mensas* 272–273). Thus, with Atreus’s opening scene, Seneca not only questions aspects of his philosophy, but he also signals his connection with Neronian literary taste as well as to its progenitor, Ovid. As Tarrant has demonstrated, one of Seneca’s main pretexts and models for his tragedies is the *Metamorphoses*.³⁴ Specifically in the case of *Thyestes*, Seneca self-consciously builds upon and attempts to surpass Ovid’s story of the infanticidal revenge of Procne (*Metamorphoses* 6.424–674). Indeed, this connection is signaled by the Fury at the start of the play: “Let the Thracian crime happen in greater number” (*Thracium fiat nefas / maiore numero* 56–57).

Seneca’s Atreus, like many of his characters, is a strong reader and manipulator of a long line of texts and genres. Indeed, Atreus’s self-creation blurs the lines between the worlds of literature and philosophy. It is on this point that we see some of the strongest connections between Seneca’s two bodies of work. Not only does Atreus self-consciously look to Procne and Philomela as exemplars, he also combines the roles of dramaturge and spectator as he delights in opening the doors to watch his brother’s funereal feast (908–910). Atreus’s dramatic self-creation also brings about a recognition scene. He asks his brother if he recognizes the remains of his children, to which Thyestes responds, “I recognize my brother” (*agnosco fratrem* 1006). On a metapoetic level, by enacting Seneca’s version of the story, Atreus has become identifiable as Atreus, the character he plays. The idea of making oneself recognizable is also an important concept in Seneca’s philosophy. Through Seneca’s exchange of letters with Lucilius, he comes to recognize his friend (*agnosco Lucilium meum, Epistulae morales* 31.1). In letter 120, Seneca highlights the theatrical aspects of this ideal. In life we wear so many different masks that we should make certain that, even if we cannot play one consistent role, we should at least attempt to remain recognizable (*adnosci*) to others (*Epistulae morales* 120.21–22). As we shall see further below, images and ideas from the theater shape Seneca’s philosophy. Typically, however, the flow of influence is seen as heading in the opposite direction. Seneca’s philosophy must somehow explain and justify his plays.

What lessons, if any, Seneca hoped his audience would take away from his tragedies remains one of the most vexed questions in Senecan studies. His discussions of audience response to drama in his philosophy offer a standard portrait of drama’s didactic power. In his letters Seneca notes that drama can

34 Tarrant (1978: 261–63).

lead the spectators to admit their faults (*Epistulae morales* 108.10). In another letter he tells a story about how Euripides was once almost driven from the theater when one of his characters praised wealth. Euripides calmed the audience by assuring them that avarice would be properly punished by the play's end (*Epistulae morales* 115.15). Seneca's plays do not provide any easy and moralistic endings. Vice remains triumphant. When discussing the effects of violence on spectators in the arena, Seneca notes that these bad examples corrupt the audience (*Epistulae morales* 7.1–6). How then could he have hoped that the representation of violence and the passions in his plays would not have had a similar effect? Do his plays undermine Stoicism by stirring up the audience's passions? Or are they intended to test the audience's invulnerability? In *De ira*, Seneca states that the physical reactions caused by dramatic spectacles are not emotion, but rather the uncontrollable preludes to emotion. Even the Stoic wise man will experience them (2.2.1–6; see also *Epistulae morales* 57.3–4). Seneca's plays could be seen as Stoic tests designed to evaluate one's ability to judge properly and not succumb to emotion. Yet the question still remains, even if we accept Seneca's theory in *De ira*, how can people who are unaware of it be prevented from misunderstanding their initial reaction to the play and emotionally identifying with characters such as Atreus and Medea? Do his plays encourage our sympathetic identification with and admiration for his characters or do they impede it? Rather than offering simple solutions, reading Senecan tragedy and philosophy in tandem reveals the full complexity of Seneca's thought. His tragedies demonstrate the depth of his engagement with the problem of the passions, their relationship to reason, and the fact that evil, emotion-driven characters are impressive. As Schiesaro points out, their terrible over-the-top grandeur has a bewitching and mesmerizing quality that even Seneca, for all his pious protests, could not ignore.³⁵ Why do we find figures like Medea and Atreus impressive despite the acts they commit? In his plays Seneca forced himself and forces his audience to confront this problem head on.

While on one level Seneca provides overly neat and didactic explanations of drama and denies its immediate emotional impact on the audience, on a deeper level, drama is an important motif in Seneca's thought. He frequently uses theatrical metaphors to describe our place in the world. As we have seen, the goal of recognition is present in both in his tragedy and philosophy. As Seneca gives his tragic characters a strong metatheatrical element, so in his philosophy selfhood is often represented as a performance on the world stage. In a

35 Schiesaro (2003: 255).

passage that inspired Shakespeare's *Macbeth* (5.5.24–27), Seneca notes that we play poorly the parts that have been assigned to us by Fortune in the “mime of human life” (*hic humanae vitae mimus*, *Epistulae morales* 80.7).³⁶ Seneca continues that we should always be aware of the reality that lies behind the masks of actors on stage, as well the masks worn in real life (*Epistulae morales* 80.8). In order to illustrate this point he cites passages from an unknown tragedy about Atreus. As a further link to his tragedies, the theatrical performance of death is also a favorite topic in Seneca's philosophy. Seneca scripts two dramatic monologues for Cato the Younger before he committed suicide rather than surrender to Julius Caesar (*De providentia* 2.10; *Epistulae morales* 24.7). In *De providentia*, Seneca highlights the theatrical nature of this suicide. Cato acts as the gods watch on, and then call him back for an encore, after his first attempt was unsuccessful (*De providentia* 2.11–12).³⁷ Seneca also notes that the memorable deaths of Cato and others like him are not “beyond imitation” (*supra imitationem*) as is commonly thought (*Epistulae morales* 70.22).

This is a point that Seneca took to heart. In April of 65 AD, Seneca was forced to commit suicide by Nero, due to his alleged involvement in a plot, headed by Gaius Calpurnius Piso, to murder the emperor. In the account of his death preserved by Tacitus, Seneca's suicide references the deaths of both of his philosophical heroes. First Seneca, and his wife, Paulina, mimic Cato and heroically cut their arms. Yet Seneca's blood does not flow quickly enough from his aged body, so like Cato, a second attempt is necessary. The veins are opened in Seneca's legs and in the backs of his knees. Death by exsanguination proves to be too slow a process for Seneca and Paulina, however. This delay allows for Paulina to be spared by Nero, but Seneca is shown no such mercy. In order to hasten his end, Seneca follows Socrates and drinks hemlock. This method as well does not have an immediate effect, so after following his two exemplars, Seneca finally expires in the heat of his own bathhouse (*Annales* 15.63–64). For Staley, Seneca's death is the perfect union of drama and philosophy. By imitating Socrates, Seneca performs the Platonic ideal of the “truest tragedy.”³⁸ Yet Tacitus's account is full of ambiguities. Since his Catonian and Socratic deaths are unsuccessful, does it mean that Seneca failed to follow his exemplars? Or, like his tragedies, does it mean that Seneca is able to incorporate and surpass his models? We must also bear in mind the less favorable version of Seneca's

36 Staley (2010: 123 and 134–36).

37 On the relationship between Cato's speech in *De providentia*, complete with address and command to his *animus*, and Senecan tragedy, cf. Star (2012: 50–52 and 65).

38 Staley (2010: 125–128).

death in Dio Cassius (62.25.1–3). Nevertheless, Seneca's death, seen as that of a Stoic saint, philosophical failure, or compromised courtier, initiates a long tradition of artistic exploration in its own right, as Ker has demonstrated.³⁹

Seneca's life and works soon served as a model for the final surviving examples of Roman tragedy, *Hercules Oetaeus* and *Octavia*, which have come down to us because they were once believed to be by Seneca himself. Today, it is generally held that both works were composed after Seneca's death, but by authors who had read his works closely. The date of *Hercules Oetaeus* continues to be a matter of debate, with some scholars putting it as late as the early second century.⁴⁰ At 1996 lines, *Hercules Oetaeus* is the longest drama to survive from antiquity. It tells the story of Hercules's betrayal by his jealous wife, Deianira, followed by his suicide and apotheosis. The first four acts follow the basic structure of Sophocles's *Thrachiniae*, but vividly describe Hercules's self-immolation and apotheosis at the end. On this point, the play's source is likely Ovid (*Metamorphoses* 9.229–272). The conclusion of the play is also overlaid with Stoicizing material. It seems as if this imitator of Seneca was unsatisfied with the problematic portrayal of Stoic ideas in Seneca's plays and endeavored to correct Seneca and write a true Stoic tragedy.⁴¹ The suffering of Hercules is rewarded with divinization.⁴² Hercules speaks from heaven in order to assure his mother of the eternal reward for his endurance (1940–1943; 1963–1976). Also unlike the plays securely by Seneca, but like *Octavia*, *Hercules Oetaeus* ends with a choral ode. The Chorus calls on the audience to live with “manly virtue” (*virtus* 1983) and to be brave (*fortes* 1984), so that their final day will not be their last. Rather, “glory will open a path to the gods above” (*iter ad superos gloria pandet* 1988).

The *praetexta Octavia*, written at an uncertain date after the death of Nero in June 68 AD, engages with Seneca's political life, as well as his philosophy and his tragedies.⁴³ The dialogue between Seneca and Nero follows the basic outline of the dialogue between Atreus and his minister in *Thyestes*. In Seneca's play, the minister soon ceases from attempting to dissuade Atreus from

39 Ker (2009).

40 For questions about the date of this play and the still debated question of authorship, cf. Littlewood (2014: 515).

41 But contrast the argument of Walde (1992) against a Stoic reading of this play.

42 As in Seneca's *Hercules furens*, this play also suggests the darker side of Hercules's heroism (e.g. 167–170, 420–422, 1264), as Littlewood (2014: 517) points out.

43 On various positions put forth concerning the date of this play, with full bibliography, cf. Ferri (2014: 521–22).

avenging himself on his brother. He quickly offers advice on how to kill Thyestes, which is judged by Atreus to be too lenient (*Thyestes* 244–248). By the end of their dialogue, the minister fearfully submits to Atreus's orders to remain quiet about his plans, but adds the hollow qualification that his silence is the product more of loyalty than fear (335). In *Octavia*, Seneca may not be able to dissuade Nero from divorcing his wife for Poppaea, but he does not submit to or approve of the emperor's plans.

In addition to its connection to *Thyestes*, this play also offers a commentary on *De clementia*. This link with Seneca's treatise is clearly signaled at the start of the exchange between Seneca and Nero. In response to Nero's claim that he must kill Plautus and Sulla to rid himself from fear (441), Seneca responds, "A great remedy for fear is mercy" (*magnum timoris remedium clementia est* 442). Several themes from *De clementia* are presented by Seneca. Nero should respect the people in order to remain safe (*De clementia* 1.19.5; *Octavia* 456). Nero should see himself as the father of the fatherland (*De clementia* 1.14.2; *Octavia* 444). His rise to power was without bloodshed (*De clementia* 1.1.5; *Octavia* 482). In *De clementia*, Nero's voice is carefully scripted by Seneca. He only allows one brief objection from the young emperor (1.8.1). The dramatic structure of *Octavia* undermines Seneca's carefully constructed portrayal of Nero in *De clementia*. The play allows him to respond directly to Seneca. He does so with sinister logic and black humor. To Seneca's point that the gods must approve of Nero's actions, the emperor refers to the divinization of his adopted father Claudius, "I would foolishly fear the gods, when I myself create them" (*stulte verebor, ipse cum faciam, deos* 449). When Seneca offers a brief and sanitized version of Augustus's rise to power (477–491), Nero responds with a lengthy and vivid account of the blood that Augustus spilled (503–529). Interestingly, Nero's account of Augustus's violence is also based on *De clementia*. In this treatise the positive image of Augustus is downplayed. At the start of the work Seneca declares that Nero does not need to look to Augustus as an example (1.1.6). Later, he states that Augustus only adopted a policy of mercy late in life. Unlike Nero, this virtue was not innate or genuine; Augustus only relented because his cruelty had been exhausted (1.11.1–2; see also 1.9.1). Nero echoes this point in *Octavia*. He notes that only after a long series of civil wars "the tired victor sheathed his swords which had been blunted by savage wounds" (*condidit tandem suos / iam fessus enses victor hebetatos feris / vulneribus* 524–526). Unlike Seneca's claim in *De clementia* that Augustus eventually relented once his power was established, in *Octavia* Nero states that only fear maintained Augustus's position (*et continuit imperium metus* 526).

Nero in *Octavia* is part of a line of Roman tyrants who test the limits of their power and whose mode of command can be summed up by Accius's "Let them

hate, provided that they fear.”⁴⁴ Originally written during the late second or early first century BC, this line came to shape Roman discourse about autocracy and continually reappeared in tragedy, philosophy and history. During the dying days of the Republic and the final months of his life, Cicero quoted Accius’s Atreus in his philosophy and oratory. When discussing decorum in *De officiis*, Cicero draws an example from the theater and notes that playwrights must script lines that are suitable for their characters. A line such as “let them hate” would not be put in the mouth of a character such as Minos, who is considered to be a just figure. When Atreus declaims these words, however, the audience breaks out in applause (*De officiis* 1.97). Cicero also quotes this line in his first *Philippic* (1.34). Here Cicero shifts from using this line to note how the representation of tyranny is celebrated on the stage to the very real dangers in Roman politics after the assassination of Julius Caesar. In this speech, Cicero quotes Accius in order to steer Mark Antony away from tyranny and offers the example of how the Caesar’s death was welcomed by the people (1.35).

Seneca investigates this line three times in his philosophy. He first discusses this passage in psychological terms in his dialogue *De ira*. At the conclusion of book one, his interlocutor seems to think along the lines of Cicero in *De officiis*, and asks whether certain utterances, although arising from a person in the grips of anger, may still be admirable and reveal one’s “greatness of soul” (1.20.4). To counter this argument, Seneca immediately offers Atreus’s words as an example and argues that these words are “detestable” and only admired by the ignorant. Writing some years after the completion of *De ira*, Seneca again considers the significance of Atreus’s words in *De clementia*.⁴⁵ In book one (1.12.4), he treats this line in a political context and notes that hatred and fear do not provide safety to tyrants. Rather, by embracing Atreus’s line, tyrants have been driven to their doom. Echoing his discussion in *De ira*, Seneca later admits that people are impressed by these words (2.2.2–3).

Seneca had reason to worry about the young and impressionable Nero being captivated by this line and modeling his rule upon it. This concern did not

44 It appears that Augustus co-opted the anti-tyrannical sentiment that may have been found in Republican dramatizations of this myth by commissioning Lucius Varius Rufus to write a *Thyestes* to be staged at his triple triumph of 29 BC; cf. Boyle (2006: 160–62).

45 Based on internal evidence, *De clementia* can be dated between 15 December 55 and 14 December 56, as Seneca notes that Nero has recently completed his 18th year (*duodevicensimum egressus annum* 1.9.1). The dating of *De ira* is much less secure, but it was likely written during Seneca’s exile (41–49 AD), and possibly as late as 52. On the dating of Seneca’s prose works, cf. Griffin (1992: 395–411), and more recently, on all of Seneca’s surviving works, Marshall (2014: 33–44).

simply arise because he knew already of Nero's love for the stage. According to Suetonius, two of Nero's predecessors had turned to Accius for inspiration. Tiberius emended the line to the more philanthropic and politically acceptable, "Let them hate, provided that they approve" (*oderint, dum probent Tiberius* 59.2). This change would not last long. Tiberius's successor Caligula restored the line to the original and repeatedly quoted it as a motto for his style of rule (*Caligula* 30.1).

Although in *De ira* and *De clementia* Seneca decries the fact that people, emperors included, are more impressed with Atreus's angry words than those expressing clemency and goodness, in his own representation of Atreus in *Thyestes*, Seneca is not to be outdone by his Republican predecessor. Rather than simply repeating the famous line, Seneca's Atreus offers his own take on the tyrant's power over his subjects: "Let them want what they do not want" (*quod nolunt velint* 211). With this pithy three-word sentence Seneca not only references Accius's tyrant, but also surpasses his model. Seneca's Atreus is not content to have his subjects hate him privately. He wishes to control the internal world of their wishes and desires.⁴⁶ Furthermore, the larger context of this passage explodes a key idea presented in *De clementia* (1.13.5). Echoing Seneca's advice to Nero, Atreus's minister vainly encourages his master to avoid causing his subjects to fear him, stating that the praise they offer to their ruler is not genuine. Atreus easily turns this idea on its head. In fact, he welcomes flattery and insincere praise as proof of his exalted position. He counters that even a base man may receive genuine praise; false praise comes only to the powerful (207–211). Thus, with characteristic intertextual ambidexterity, in this passage from *Thyestes*, Seneca references both the dramatic tradition of Roman tragedy and his own philosophical writings. The afterlife of Accius's famous line does not end here. Although we have no evidence that Nero himself quoted these words, the author of *Octavia* thought it was right for his Nero to reference them. As we have seen, throughout their dialogue the stage Nero and Seneca allude to Atreus and the minister from *Thyestes* as well as tenets from *De clementia*. For good measure, Accius's Atreus line is alluded to one last time in Roman drama. Nero counters Seneca's claim that loyalty (*fides*) is a better protection than the sword by stating, "It is fitting for Caesar to be feared" (*decet timeri Caesarem* 457).

The long series of manifestations and discussions of Accius's famous line demonstrates the vitality of the dialogue between Roman tragedy and philosophy and how it spilled over into oratory and history. While seen as foreign practices, the Romans adopted tragedy and philosophy to investi-

46 Schiesaro (2003: 162).

gate their most pressing intellectual and political concerns. Accius's line succinctly encapsulates their fears about autocracy and self-willed vice. Despite the claims that Seneca makes in his philosophy about the wretched life of the tyrant, Atreus revels in his position and power. He paradoxically uses reason to control his passions, avenge himself, and, in Seneca's play, achieve a form of divinity. Furthermore, he remains an impressive and memorable figure, worthy of imitation. As Cicero points out and Seneca laments, people applaud and admire Atreus's words. In the Roman imagination, their own history would trump tragedy and philosophy, as Atreus would take on human form and be played and surpassed by Caesar, Antony, Caligula and Nero.

Theatrical Language and Philosophical Issues in Seneca's Tragedies: Cued and Unannounced Entrances (Especially *Oedipus* 81 and 784)

Jean-Pierre Aygon

Many questions still remain unresolved about the relationship between Seneca's tragedies and the author's stoicism.¹ This paper demonstrates that when we pay attention to the dramatic nature of these texts, we uncover productive arguments on this issue. Even if these tragedies had never been put into performance on a formal stage and even if they had been written to be read and not performed, matters I do not propose to discuss in this contribution,² we must not forget that the readers of dramatic texts in Graeco-roman antiquity tried to imagine the staging of the plays. Two witnesses are very clear on this point: Dio of Prusa, a close contemporary of Plutarch, wrote after reading the versions of *Philoctetes* by Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides that he had taken great pleasure in the spectacle (εὐωχούμην τῆς θείας, 52.2.3). Donatus, the fourth century AD grammarian, stated that while reading the texts of comedies one must imagine in his mind precisely the gestures of the actors: *et simul gestum considera loquentis ex uerbis* (ad *Ad.* 265.4).³

This contribution focuses on the different forms of stage entrance as an element of the dramatic language. This subject has been precisely studied by Taplin for Attic dramas,⁴ but the importance of Seneca's innovations have not been given enough weight. Sutton methodically listed entrance cues, among

1 For the recent *status quaestionis*, cf. Schiesaro 2003; Staley 2010; Aygon forthcoming.

2 On these questions, cf. Harrison (ed.) 2000a; Kugelmeier 2007; Aygon 2006 and forthcoming, chap. 5.

3 Cf. Bureau and Nicolas (2014: 281): "Donat n'a pas d'autre matériau que le texte de Térence, auquel il se montre très attentif. Il en fait d'ailleurs un dogme méthodologique: *Ad.* 265.4 (*et simul gestum considera loquentis ex uerbis*), en même temps qu'on lit les mots du personnage qui parle, il faut se représenter sa gestuelle."

4 Taplin's complex analysis can be resumed roughly in two observations:

1. entrances are not always announced, cf. [1977] ²1989: 71 "Entrance announcements are, of course, common in Greek tragedy. It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that they are almost invariably used: in fact only just under half of all entries are announced."

2. But, as he proved with his systematic study of Aeschylus' tragedies, there is generally very few uncertainty about entrances, cf. [1977] ²1989: 8 "Many arrivals are clearly marked [...]. **Even when they are not** [my emphasis] their occurrence is nearly always clear". See also studies of selected exits or entrances in Taplin [1978] ³1989: 31–57.

other aspects, noting that “it is characteristic of Senecan technique that not all entrances or exits are textually cued”.⁵ But he limited his observations to concerns over the staging of these tragedies, arriving at the conclusion that “Seneca intended his plays for production in a normal Roman theater”. More recently, Kohn tried to interpret further Seneca’s use of announced entrances (or not), and offered interesting insights, but his conclusions are sometimes too quickly “argumented”.⁶ I think that we need to classify different types of entrances (or exits), to construct Seneca’s “grammar” on this point, to fix standards and determine the role of conventions, in order to analyse some “écarts” in comparaisson to the “rule”. This article is an essay in this direction.

Therefore, I will restrict my attention to entrances within a scene, or *actus*,⁷ and also entries within prologues. Choral entrances will not be included in this discussion as also what happens on stage at the conclusion of a choral ode. Further, I will only consider the seven complete plays which are attributed with certainty to Seneca (*Hercules Furens*, *Troades*, *Medea*, *Phaedra*, *Oedipus*, *Agamemnon* and *Thyestes*), in order to establish some commonalities or dominant tendencies in the working methods of the dramatist and to underline by contrast some peculiar cases or exceptions.

Stage entrances can be divided into two types: 1. when one character enters (or speaks) after the entrance monologue of another character or 2. when a character’s entry cuts into or follows a dialogue.

1 Character B Enters or Speaks after Character A’s Monologue (12)⁸

1.1 Textually Cued Entrances of a Character after a Monologue (3)

There are only two examples of cued entrances that are clear. At the end of her monologue, the *nutrix* announces Medea’s arrival (*Medea* 738–739):

⁵ Sutton (1986: 43).

⁶ For example, it is very contestable to link the fact that many of the entrances and exits are uncertain in *Hercules Furens* with the madness of Hercules (2013: 108). Besides, if in *Medea* “Jason’s movements on and off the stage are never announced”, is it evident to conclude that “this fits in nicely with Medea’s own perceptions of the man” (92)? Comparaisons with Hellenistic theater (in the limit of possibilities) and Roman comedy would also be necessary.

⁷ Concerning the notion of *actus*, I follow Anliker (1960) and François-Garelli (in Dumont & François-Garelli 1998: 155–57) that the chorus divides the drama into different *acts*.

⁸ I do not take into account monologues that are isolated where one character arrives on stage, then goes out alone, before the entrance of a new *persona* (as in some prologues), nor monologues that are followed by a dialogue with the chorus.

Sonuit ecce vesano gradu
canitque. mundus vocibus primis tremit.⁹

There! The sound of her maddened steps and
her chanting. The world trembles at her first words.

Medea then describes at length the magical practices she accomplishes on stage: this particular scene is thus two successive monologues. In *Phaedra*, at the end of his prayer to Diana, the *nutrix* suddenly sees Hippolytus before he addresses her beginning at verse 431 (424–425):

ipsum intuoꝛ sollemne venerantem sacrum
nullo latus comitante—quid dubitas?

I see the very man worshipping at the customary shrine,
no companion at his side. Why hesitate?

We also find an example of an indirect cue in Thyestes' progressive entrance suggested by some textual tokens (*Thyestes* 885–919): at the end of the banquet given in honour of Thyestes, and peripherally his three sons, Atreus advances alone on the stage (*gradior*, 885), and gives a long triumphal monologue; he orders the opening of the palace's doors (*fores / templi relaxa*, 901–902), observes Thyestes' attitude at the table (903–919) beginning with *Libet videre* (it is pleasing to see, 903) and then tells himself that he can hear Thyestes singing (*Ecce iam cantus ciet*, 918). Thyestes' appearance is problematic: whether he enters directly or via the mechanism of the *eccyclema* (or the *exostra*), it allows the spectator to see and hear him sing (920–969).¹⁰ At the end of his monody, Thyestes indicates that he will hide from his brother his misgivings (*credula praesta pectora fratri*, 963), which presumes that Atreus has been approaching steadily and that Thyestes has just noticed his presence. Atreus initiates the dialogue that follows, and he clearly has prepared what he will

9 All quotations from Seneca are from Zwierlein, OCT, ³1988, and the English translations from Fitch, 2002 and 2004; all citations of Sophocles' *O.T.* are from Pearson, OCT, 1975, and the English translations from Lloyd-Jones, 1994.

10 I don't think that the utilization of a sort of *siparium* (the curtain used by mimes) is necessary, as proposed by Fortey and Glucker (1975: 705). It is quite possible for the theatrical conventions of Seneca's time that a character arriving and speaking on stage (Thyestes) does not remark the presence of another character who looks at him (Atreus): cf. Lycus at *Herc. Fur.* 332–353, Creon at *Med.* 179–186.

say: *Festum diem, germane, consensu pari / celebremus* ("my own brother, we must celebrate this festive day in mutual harmony", 970–971). This transition is carefully managed by the dramatist, to add emphasis to an exceptional situation and to launch with irony one of the greatest recognition scenes in all of ancient drama.

1.2 *Unannounced Entrance*¹¹ of a Character after a Monologue (9)

However, more frequently, there are no indications for stage entrance.

1.2.1 B Confidant (*Nutrix* or *Satelles*) Begins a Dialogue with A Protagonist (4)¹²

There is a standard pattern to this type of Seneca's uncued entrances: it is always B, the minor character, who announces his, or her, presence by speaking first. In three cases out of four, B hears what A was saying, at least the last words: *nutrix* and *Medea* (*Medea* 150–154), *nutrix* and *Phaedra* (*Phaedra* 129–130) and *satelles* and *Atræus* (*Thyestes* 204–205), where B appears on stage quietly before he or she speaks. In only one case (*Agamemnon* 125–127), B (*nutrix*) says explicitly that she did not hear what A (*Clytemnestra*) was saying:

Regina Danaum et inclitum Ledaë genus,
quid tacita versas quidve consilii impotens
tumido feroces impetus animo geris?

Queen of the Danaans, glorious child of Leda:
why ponder in silence, and keep fierce impulses
unchecked in your fevered mind?

11 When there is no entrance cue, a character himself has to reveal his presence, because he could have already been onstage for a certain amount of time, and in this case, it is impossible to speak of an "entry line" or "entrance character". Sutton (1986: 43–44) raises the question but is wrong while using the phrase "entry line", for example, in regards to *Jocasta* who replies to what *Oedipus* has just said (at *Oed.* 81), implying that she was already on stage and heard what he said. Throughout Seneca's plays it is very difficult, if not impossible, to pin down the precise moment at which a character came on stage, so "beginning of dialogue" is perhaps preferable to "entrance of a character".

12 At *Phae.* 854–855, we can suppose that the *nutrix*, who answers Theseus' questions at the end of his entrance monologue (*Quis fremitus...*, 850–851), did not leave the stage. I am in agreement with Sutton (1986: 50) on this point. But if the *nutrix* was coming back on stage at this moment, it would be the fifth case of this type of uncued entrance.

Presumably the *nutrix* has entered during a reflective pause.¹³

1.2.2 Beginning of a Dialogue between Two Protagonists (5)

There are two alternatives, one where A, at the end of his monologue, addresses B or where B arrives and starts speaking.

1.2.2.1 *A (Dominating B) Opens the Dialogue* (3)

In the *Troades*, at the end of her entrance monologue (861–871a), Helen addresses Polyxena at 871b–887 (Andromache and Hecuba will answer to her, Polyxena keeping silence). Similarly at the end of his monologue (*Oedipus* 764–772), Oedipus reveals Jocasta's presence when he turns towards her (773–775):

Vnanimi coniunx, explica errores, precor:
quae spatia moriens Laius vitae tulit?
primone in aevo viridis an fracto occidit?

Wife, you share my thoughts: straighten out my confusion,
I beg you. What span of life had Laius when he died?
Did he fall when flourishing in his early prime, or in broken age?

At *Hercules Furens* 309–311, after two independent and parallel entrance monologues Amphitryon opens the dialogue by addressing Megara:

O socia nostri sanguinis, casta fide
servans torum gnatosque magnanimi Herculis,
meliora mente concipe atque animum excita.

Ally of our blood, chaste and faithful guardian
of great-hearted Hercules' marriage bed and his sons:
conceive better hopes, rouse your spirits!

13 This is an occasion for the dramatist to analyze the physiological reactions of characters in the grasp of passion: the *nutrix* tells Clytemnestra that she is reading directly into her soul (*licet ipsa sileas, totus in uultu est dolor*, despite your silence, all your pain is in your face, 128). This particularity must be connected with the beginning of the following sequence, the dialogue between Clytemnestra and Aegisthus (234–235), where the *indicia corporis* play a decisive role; cf. Aygon, forthcoming: 241–46.

Amphitryon's words prove that he heard what Megara was saying at least at the end of her discourse which was a prayer to her husband, Hercules, who had been away for a long time. Hercules' father asserts his paternal dominance and encourages Megara not to despair.

1.2.2.2 *B Opens the Dialogue (2)*

At *Thyestes* 429–430 Tantalus (Thyestes' son) shows that he did not hear his father's entrance monologue (404–420):

Quae causa cogit, genitor, a patria gradum
referre visa?

What is forcing you, father, to walk away
from sight of your fatherland?

The context makes it apparent that Tantalus, following Thyestes at some distance, noticed that his father turned back and asked him why. Thyestes initially conceals the reason why he is afraid (Atreus, as he just confessed in his monologue), exposing (unknowingly) his duplicity and his *libido regnandi*.¹⁴

At *Oedipus* 81b–82, in the prologue,¹⁵ Jocasta addresses the king, who had not been aware of her presence, interrupting him at the half-line:

Quid iuvat, coniunx, mala
gravare questu? regium hoc ipsum reor . . .

How does it help, my husband, to make troubles heavier
by remoaning them? The qualities of a king lies, I think, . . .

This is an *unicum* in the prologues of the seven complete, authentic Senecan tragedies.¹⁶ We know that Seneca does not hesitate to vary dramatic forms,

14 Accordingly, he gives to Tantalus in 446–470 reasons not to accept the risks of power, but these reasons are very general topics and in consequence less convincing than if he had presented the violent hate of his brother towards him, caused by his adultery with Merope; cf. Marchetta 2010 and Aygon, forthcoming: 226–28.

15 I consider, as also Anliker (1960: 29–35), Töchterle (1994: 135) and Boyle (2011: 100), that the first 109 verses, those before the first chorus constitutes the complete prologue or *actus* 1.

16 I have not included the *Phoenissae* because this drama is incomplete. Nothing is known of its prologue and it is difficult to believe that the first fragment would have been a prologue because of its exceptional length (319 lines).

and to innovate:¹⁷ four tragedies have a monologue sometimes spoken by a divinity (Juno in the *Hercules Furens*) and other times by one of the characters, not necessarily the protagonist or even antagonist (Medea, Hippolytus in the *Phaedra* and the ghost of Thyestes in the *Agamemnon*).¹⁸ In the two other cases, a dialogue is engaged after the initial monologue, once between Hecuba and the chorus in *Troades* 63–163, or between Tantalus and the Fury in *Thyestes* 23–121. But it is only in the prologue to the *Oedipus* that the response of a protagonist, Jocasta (81b–86), engages directly and meaningfully with what Oedipus (1–81a), another protagonist, had just said. It is impossible to know with certainty when Jocasta enters the stage, but it is clear that she has surprised Oedipus' private torments: Jocasta found him lying on the ground, in prostration in front of the altar, and heard his discourse, at least its end, while Oedipus thought he was alone.¹⁹

1.3 Conclusion

The way Seneca portrays the entrance of characters after the monologue of another character is more often than not an entrance without cues. What is unique about Jocasta's entrance (*Oedipus* 81b–82) is that it happens in the prologue. This passage will, thus, receive more detailed analysis below (271–72).

2 Unannounced Entrance or Cued Entrance of a New Character within a Dialogue (21)

Before looking at the unique features of the prologue to the *Oedipus*, however, I should like to categorize cued and uncued entrances within a dialogue.

2.1 Textually Cued Entrances within a Dialogue (17)

Most frequent, but with a great variety of forms, is the arrival of a new character in the course of dialogue carefully announced.

17 Cf. Harrison's conclusion (2000b: 145): "Seneca was one of the great innovators of the stage and the boldness of his innovations has contributed greatly to the survival of his plays."

18 On these Senecan prologues, cf. Mazzoli's synthesis, (1998).

19 Boyle (2011: 101) is right to consider that Jocasta's late entrance suits the dramatic situation better, but this is only a hypothesis as the text leaves the choice open: the queen may be present from the beginning "on the side".

Hercules Furens (2)

- 329–331, cued entrance, announced by Megara, and monologue of Lycus (332–357)
 637, cued presence of Theseus, revealed by Hercules before he leaves the stage, and before Theseus speaks (640–644)

Troades (3)

- 360–371, entrance and speech of Chalcas announced “à l’avance” at 351–352 by an order of Agamemnon
 518, cued entrance and speech of Ulysses (524–555) announced by the *senex* and confirmed at 522–523 by Andromache
 999–1000a, Hecuba announces the entrance of Pyrrhus, addresses him (1000b–1008), but he does not speak

Medea (2)

- 177–178, cued entrance and monologue of Creon (179–187), announced by Medea
 978–981, entrance and speech of Jason, followed by guards, announced “à l’avance” at 971–972 by Medea (noise made by soldiers: *Quid repens affert sonus? / parantur arma [...]*)

Phaedra (3)

- 384–386, cued “vision” of Phaedra (on the balcony, described by her *nutrix*), and monologue (387–403)
 583, cued entrance of Phaedra, announced by her *nutrix* who addresses her at 587–588, before Phaedra speaks at 589–590
 864–867: presence on stage of Phaedra, revealed by Theseus who addresses her, announced “à l’avance” by Theseus hearing her tears and lamentations (850–853) and the *nutrix* who addresses her through the palace’s door at 862 before she (or Theseus, it depends on the editor) asks attendants to open it at 863

Oedipus (2)

- 288–290, cued entrance of Tiresias and Manto by Creon; 291–292: Oedipus questions Tiresias before he speaks. This interruption is essential: if Creon continued it would have become apparent to Oedipus that Laius was killed by him
 838b–841a, cued entrance of Phorbas (by Oedipus), whose presence had been ordered by Oedipus (823–824)

Agamemnon (5)

586–588, cued entrance of chorus and Cassandra, announced by Clytemnestra after Eurybates' long account of the fall of Troy and return of the Greek fleet

778–781, cued entrance of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra, announced by the chorus in the fourth act, where Cassandra and chorus engage in a dialogue

916–917, cued entrance of Strophius, announced by Electra interrupting her dialogue with Orestes

947–950, cued entrance of Clytemnestra, announced by Electra

978–979, cued entrance of Aegisthus, acknowledged by Clytemnestra

2.2 *Textually Unannounced Entrances within a Dialogue* (4)²⁰

Aside from the normal ways in which Seneca brought a new character into a scene, there are some few passages in which the arrival of a character happens within a dialogue in progress and that character's presence is only revealed when he or she begins speaking. The new speaker manifests his presence either by launching into an entrance monologue or by addressing those already on the stage.

2.2.1 Entrance Monologue of a Character (3)²¹

In *Thyestes* 491–507, Atreus' entrance monologue is an abrupt aside to the audience in which he does not make his presence known to his brother until 508–511. His sudden appearance interrupts the dialogue between Thyestes and his son Tantalus, which had at any rate arrived at an end since they decided to accept Atreus' offer to share the throne, and to move into the palace. It is logical to infer that Atreus had not heard their discussion nor did Thyestes and Tantalus immediately register Atreus' presence on the stage; it seems plausible to assume that Atreus came from the palace (the central door at the back of the stage) and saw them coming from the left wing (*venit*, 495).

20 I do not include two peculiar occurrences: *Troad.* 203–204, because the dialogue between Pyrrhus et Agamemnon follows directly the preceding one between Talthybius and the chorus, that is, it does not continue with any of over-lapping characters; *Ag.* 910, because Electra's unannounced entrance and Orestes' follow neither a dialogue (even if the chorus and Cassandra are together onstage) nor a monologue, since Cassandra's discourse, which precedes, is similar to a messenger speech.

21 I do not take into consideration the *nutrix*'s monologue at *Phae.* 719–720 because she stays onstage throughout the confrontation (589–718); cf. Sutton (1986: 51).

Aegisthus' entrance monologue (*Agamemnon* 226–233), similarly follows on a dialogue between Clytemnestra and her *nutrix* and consists in a private rumination to himself which he cannot, and would not, expect Clytemnestra to hear, before he addresses her directly (234–238).²² The sticomathy between Clytemnestra and the *nutrix* gave way to a longer speech by Clytemnestra and then a similar one by the *nutrix* at the end of which Clytemnestra was perturbed and had fallen into silence.²³

So, too, Jason appears unannounced and launches into a 14 verse monologue (*Medea* 431–444), unaware that Medea and her *nutrix* had been debating what to do. His aside to himself, shared with the audience, but not overheard by Medea,²⁴ fills the space in a pause in the dialogue between the *nutrix* and Medea, who was silent after the *nutrix*'s call to act with prudence (429–430).

Certainly, these unannounced entrances suit the dramatic needs of the situation in which a monologue by a fresh character rescues a dialogue that had reached its natural conclusion.²⁵ It is confirmed by what happens in the opposite situation, the two cued entrance monologues (*supra* 2.1) in which Lycus (*Hercules Furens* 332–353) and Creon (*Medea* 179–187) are both preceded by a well marked entrance cue by someone who was speaking and whose thought was thus ended before he was finished.²⁶

22 Following partially Schmidt 2000: 400–29, I have distinguished three types of asides (2014b: 104–105): 1. asides *stricto sensu*; 2. asides *lato sensu* (when not within a dialogue); 3. monologues “à part”, which I argue are a kind of an aside without the intention of not being over-heard.

23 Cf. Aegisthus' description of Clytemnestra (237–238) and consult my arguments (2014a: 17–29), following Aygon (2004: 347–50).

24 This case is clear enough because there is a dramatic necessity: if Medea had seen Jason arriving, she would have cursed him immediately (contrast Jason: *atque ecce, uiso memet exiluit, furit*, 445). Cf. Costa (1973), *ad* 445: “Jason and M. appear to catch sight of each other simultaneously”; Boyle (2014), *ad* 431–46, speaks without doubt of “Jason's entrance monologue aside”.

25 These three passages also underline different forms of duplicity: Atreus (*Thy.* 491–507) announces that he will mislead his brother; Aegisthus confesses his fear that he will hide from Clytemnestra (*Ag.* 226–233); Jason reveals his self-blindness: Medea will disclose his true motives at 529, a hidden *libido regnandi*. On the duplicity of numerous Senecan protagonists, cf. Aygon, forthcoming, esp., chap. 8, 3.

26 But this does not hinder the monologues of Lycus or Creon, since they are not supposed to immediately see the other *personae* already onstage.

2.2.2 Direct Beginning of a New Dialogue (1)

The entrance of the *senex Corinthius* (*Oedipus* 784), following the dialogue between Oedipus and Jocasta, is unique among Seneca's tragedies and so deserves fuller discussion (below 277–79).²⁷ Zwierlein noted the lack of transition between the two scenes, considering it as a failure in the construction of the play.²⁸ I prefer to think that it is deliberate, and look for its meaning: building on comparisons with the three other uncued entrances noted above (*Thyestes* 491–493, *Agamemnon* 226–227, and *Medea* 431–432), I propose the following hypothesis: this presentation of the *senex Corinthius*' entrance signifies that he arrived at a silence, that is, a “pregnant pause”, at the end of the dialogue between Oedipus and Jocasta, and that this silence is meaningful.

2.3 Conclusion

Nearly everytime a new character enters the stage during a dialogue, his arrival is announced by a verbal cue given by one of the *personae* already speaking. This happens 17 times out of 21 entrance characters within an *actus*. There are only 4 exceptions to this rule: for three of them, it is linked with an entrance monologue and, in the one other case, directly at the beginning of a new dialogue. I think that it is not accidental that these unannounced entrances signal a silence or a pause in the dialogue between the characters who are already onstage.

-
- 27 The unusually rough transition between two scenes worried the medieval copyists: the marginalia in the manuscripts of the *A* tradition (*Senex chorintius. edipus*) and the wrong attribution of 825–827, 829–832 and 835–836 to the *senex* and not to Jocasta demonstrate that some of them thought that Jocasta went out quickly after 783. However, Zwierlein (1983: 254–55), followed by Töchterle (1994: 531) and other recent editors, such as Fitch (2004) and Boyle (2011) thought that manuscripts in the *E* tradition (*SENEX.CORINTHVS. IDEM*) signals clearly the presence of Jocasta onstage, and (accepting the correction of the *mss.* by Weil [1897: 328]) that verses 825–827, 829–832 and 835–836 could be pronounced by Jocasta, not by the *senex*. Contra, Kohn (2013: 43–44) considers that Jocasta must leave the stage after 783, but for a contestable reason (to avoid having four actors on the *pulpitum*) since Kohn (2013: 33–34 and 48) accepts that four actors are necessary for the *extispicium* scene in the same tragedy. On the “rule” of three actors, see recently Harrison & Liapis (2013, *Introd.*: 6–8); Marshall (2013: 257–78) and Liapis (2013: 235–53), who concludes his study of *Rhesus*' staging by admitting that at this time “fifth-century conventions were giving way to experimentation with new dramatic forms” (352). Kohn (2013: 43) gives serious reasons to criticize the correction of the *mss.* attribution of verses 825–827, 829–832 and 835–836 to Jocasta, but I think that this attribution remains the best solution; cf. *infra*, n. 55. Whatever the original reading might be does not really matter for my demonstration.
- 28 1966: 54 and 97–98; contra, Müller (1953: 454) thinks that it is a deliberate innovation of Seneca.

This conclusion is most important for the interpretation of the last case, the uncued entrance of the *senex Corinthius*. He is a significant exception, like the unannounced entrance of Jocasta in *Oedipus'* prologue.

3 The Philosophico-political Meaning of Two Unusual Entrance Characters in the *Oedipus*

3.1 *The Confrontation between Oedipus and Jocasta in the Prologue (Oedipus 81–102)*

What is the dramatic function of Jocasta's intervention? Apparently, she does not bring any important elements for the intrigue or the action. As a matter of fact, the long monologue of the king could have been enough to characterize his mood, to insist on his feeling of culpability, his fears and desire to flee, the great difference with Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*.²⁹ But Jocasta, through her violent opposition towards her husband and her reproaches of cowardice, underlines the theme of the king's fear (81–86):

Quid iuvat, coniunx, mala
grauare questu? regium hoc ipsum reor:
adversa capere, quoque sit dubius magis
status et cadentis imperi moles labet,
hoc stare certo pressius fortem gradu:
haud est virile terga Fortunae dare.

How does it help, my husband, to make troubles
heavier by remoaning them? The qualities of a king lies,
I think, in the very ability to take on adversities. The more unsure
his situation, the more the balance of supreme power tilts toward
falling,
so much firmly should he stand, resolute and unbudging.
It is not manly to retreat before Fortune.

The answer of the king (87–88), who firmly denies having felt any fear, shows clearly that he is able to dissimulate, when he asserts the contrary to what he has confessed to himself earlier in his monologue, when he thought that he was alone:

²⁹ Well noted by the critics, cf., e.g., Paratore (1956: 103–104); Poe (1983); Paduano (1988) and (1993).

Abest pauoris crimen ac probum procul,
uirtusque nostra nescit ignauos metus.

The charge and stigma of cowardice is foreign to me,
my manhood knows no fainthearted fears.

This violent confrontation between the protagonists underlines two issues: the fear that the queen has surprised in Oedipus' heart is a very important motif for Seneca; further, Oedipus hides what he feels or thinks inside.³⁰ This is the double function of Jocasta's presence and reaction in the prologue, with some consequences for the meaning of the tragedy.

3.2 *Fear's Leitmotiv and Stoic Conception of fatum in the Oedipus*³¹

Müller considered *Oedipus* to be a different kind of tragedy because it was a *Fatumstragödie* and not a *Leidenschaftstragödie*: *fatum* (and not the passions) would be *sozusagen der Hauptakteur des Dramas*, the *Motor des Geschehens*.³² Besides, Alexander of Aphrodisias, a Peripatetic philosopher during the Severan dynasty, as part of his treatise *De fato* (Περὶ εἰμαρμένης, 31. 13), uses the formula τὸ τῆς εἰμαρμένης δῖγμα (destiny tragedy), for Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*. Commentators have found themselves in agreement with Alexander of Aphrodisias' polemic against the Stoics,³³ and have seen Oedipus' tragedy as inconsistent with the Stoic ideas of liberty and moral responsibility.³⁴

30 If some commentators, e.g., Mader (1993: 109), Littlewood (2004: 24–25), Boyle (2011, Introd.: lix) have reason to consider that Jocasta's "Stoic-colored" speech purposefully contrasts with that of Oedipus, which is "unStoic" in character, it is still not enough to justify her intervention: Seneca emphasizes the great distance between what the king says to others about himself and his true feelings.

31 For a first version of this analysis, cf. Aygon (2013: 155–57).

32 1953: 450 and 460–61.

33 Cicero quotes him in *De fato*, 31: "Will they (Stoics) say destiny used the murder of a father by his son, the incestuous marriage of a mother with her son, and the birth of children of a brother and father? How is it reasonable to believe that these events contribute to preserve world order?"

34 Besides Dingel (1974: 72–80), whose radical position is isolated; cf. Paratore (1956), Schetter ([1968] 1972), Poe 1983 and Davis (1993: 165): "Plainly, the play presents a view of the relationship between fate and moral responsibility which does not accord with orthodox Stoicism." On this point, see also Chaumartin (1999: 9): "It is a despairing vision of the world . . . Everything is happening as though Seneca went as far as temptation would allow him, many times he is cognizant of philosophy so as to put entirely in doubt the ability of human reasoning to understand destiny and to find rules of proper behaviour." Ahl (2008: 15–16) thinks that, "though characters in Senecan tragedies often use the vocabulary of

More precisely, the confrontation between Jocasta and Oedipus in the prologue, as we saw above (271–72), strongly underlines the importance of fear in the king's *psyche*. Fear is a recurring theme throughout the play that needs detailed examination.³⁵

3.2.1 The “Red Thread” of Fear in the *Oedipus*

Two themes dominate in Oedipus' monologue that opens the play (1–81): fear and flight. The main reason he fled from Corinth (*sceptra Polybi fugeram*, 12; *ego penates profugus excessi meos*, 23) is clearly expressed by the king himself (22): *hic me paternis expulit regnis timor*. At Thebes, when he finds himself powerless in the face of a plague, fear returns but Seneca makes this fear more real, more dreadful and more persistent by his repetitions (15–27): *timeo*, 15; *timor*, 22; *horreas*, 25; *metuas*, 26; *cuncta expauesco*, 27. It is in this direction, that the dramatist has oriented the confrontation between Oedipus and Jocasta. Further, words for fear are constant in the characterization of Oedipus. There are at least three causes for these fears: the crimes predicted by Apollo's oracle at Delphi; the fear that he has committed them; and lastly, the fear that is an inescapable part of being a king.

Fear and flight are also general leitmotifs throughout this play, especially in the choral odes. In the third chorus (709–763), Actaeon, whose *fatum* is identified with that of Oedipus,³⁶ panics when he discovers he has been turned into a stag (*metuit motas zephyris plumas*, 758) and tries to escape his destiny

-
- determinism, the dark universe they envisage, a universe in which there is no sense of a beneficent Providence or of any force capable of controlling the wickedness of humanity, does not fit well into the brighter Stoic slipper.” Cf. also, Boyle (2011: Introd., “Fate, Guilt and Rome”, lxxx), who concludes: “This is no Stoic world, but one irremediably diseased.”
- 35 Paduano (1993: 15) is right when he states that fear is “la corda emotiva principale e definitoria del personaggio”, but he draws no consequence from his remark. Töchterle (1994: 21) notices, only in the first part of the drama, the “zentrale Affekt der Furcht” without, however, linking this to Oedipus' responsibility: therefore he thinks that the tragedy is in contradiction with Stoicism. Boyle (2011: Introd., lix and n. 102) asserts that Oedipus' “preoccupation with fear has revealed him . . . as the antithesis of the Stoic ideal”, but at the same time he considers that his decisions are “rational” (cf. *infra* n. 45), and that the drama is “Unstoic” (cf. *supra*, n. 34). Pratt (1983: 96) alone mentions that “the destructive effect of fear” in *Oedipus*, is consistent with Stoic ethics, and judges that the piece, chiefly because its outcome, is “a successful dramatization of Stoic thought about Fate” (101). I come to the same conclusion, through different arguments.
- 36 Cf. Boyle (2011: 287, *ad* 760–763): “Ovid has Actaeon discover his transformation in a pool to which he flees . . . not in the spring in which Diana had bathed. Seneca's change seems designed to strengthen the analogy between Actaeon and Oedipus: Actaeon discovers his own monstrosity by returning to the place of his origin”; the same can be said of Oedipus.

through flight (*praeceps silvas montesque fugit / citus Actaeon*, 755–756). At the end of the fourth chorus (882–914), Icarus' myth is presented in a manner that recalls once again Oedipus' story.³⁷ The verse that introduces the narration ends on the verb *timere*, which focuses on the original reason for Icarus' flight, then of his death (892–893): *Gnosium regem timens / astra dum demens petit*... Here is again another similar association of fear (*timens*, *demens*) and flight (*astra*... *petit*).

Finally, the fifth chorus (980–997) emphasizes the mistake of people who are afraid of fate. The ring composition of this ode highlights a famous Stoic tenet, that we must accept and follow our destiny³⁸ with complimentary sentiments at the beginning (980–982) and near the end (992–994):

Fatis agimur: cedit fatis; 980
non sollicitae possunt curae
mutare rati stamina fusi.

We are driven by fate, and must yield to fate.
No anxious fretting can alter
the threads from that commanding spindle.

multis ipsum metuisse nocet, 992
multi ad fatum uenere suum
dum fata timent.³⁹

Many are hurt by fear itself,
many have come upon their fate
through fear of fate.

37 Seneca imagines that Icarus dies because he cannot swim, his hands hindered by the threads of his wings (*manus / ... implicitas*, 906–907), and he repeats a word he had already used for the Sphinx (*implicitum malum*, 640), that evokes the complex and mysterious nature of the destiny's threads; cf. my observations (2004: 408–409). Boyle is perhaps right when he judges (2011: 312) that “the use of Icarus, as a model for Oedipus' fate seems partially and significantly flawed”, but it is clear that the dramatist has gone to great lengths to make the analogy possible.

38 Cf. the famous *sententia* (Sen., *Ep.* 107, 11): *Ducunt volentem fata, nolentem trahunt*.

39 Sklenář (2007/2008: 187–94) objects that on two points (god himself obeys *fatum*, 989–990; Lachesis is qualified as *dura*, 986) the fifth chorus does not exactly conform with Stoicism. But a tragedy's chorus cannot speak as a true philosopher: what is important is the link between the main theme presented by the chorus (to accept without fear his destiny) and the whole tragedy.

The final lines of the chorus (995–997) announce the re-appearance of Oedipus, and so in a real sense verses 992–994 are the final words of the choral ode. Taken with the opening to the ode (980–982) they demonstrate the decisive importance of this theme. On the basis of these lines and Stoic doctrine, it might seem that fate is the key to the interpretation of the play as a whole.⁴⁰ However, it seems difficult, even for a Stoic, to calmly accept a destiny that leads someone to kill his father and marry his mother. It is, therefore, necessary to conclude that the Stoics did not think in these terms and consider that Seneca's focus on fear is significant.

3.2.2 Fear's leitmotiv, a Clue for a Stoic Reading of the Tragedy
Apparently, in Oedipus' myth, destiny has a very negative outlook;⁴¹ logically, it is improbable that anyone would want to accept such a destiny, much less follow its dictates.⁴² But we must place this within the general issue of the compatibility between freedom and determinism for the Stoics. I will not discuss this complex question here; rather, I will only remark that we must not assimilate destiny with necessity or fatalism:⁴³ *fatum* in the Stoic sense is restricted only to admitting that events are the result of an interconnexion of causes, among which are a series of choices that require personal decisions and so create personal responsibility for those making the decisions.⁴⁴ It was not necessary, that is, unavoidable, that Oedipus commit his crimes, but it is inevitable that he would commit them once determined to obey the irrational

40 Cf. Paré-Rey (2012: 163): "Le dernier chœur d'*Œdipe* fait figure de paradoxe: au sein d'une tragédie peu sentencieuse dans ses parties chantées, c'est le chant le plus riche de tout le corpus [...] soit 8 vers sentencieux sur 19."

41 Cf. Henry and Walker (1983: 136): "Fate in *Oedipus* is not the operation of Providence, to be joyfully accepted by the wise man; it is malign and irrational, and man can neither cooperate with it nor resist it." For Lefèvre (1981) the Stoic pantheism is perverted in Seneca's tragedies; cf. Fitch (2004, introd. 13) on the fifth chorus: "This stoicizing little ode, then, looks like a foreign object lodged in the body of the play."

42 It is difficult to follow Marti (1945: 237) and to think that, for Seneca, Oedipus "is afraid of his destiny, not knowing that a wise man triumphs over his fate by willingly surrendering to it. He has physical, not moral courage". In fact, moral courage for Oedipus could with difficulty encourage him simply "surrendering" to the type of criminal destiny promised to him.

43 Cf., e.g., Muller (2006: 123–26).

44 Seneca never developed a solution for this difficult point of the Stoic doctrine but he was certain about the compatibility between *fatum* and moral responsibility; cf. Armisen-Marchetti (2000: 210–13), and the chapter that Setaioli (2014: 277–99) devotes to this problem. On the relation between freedom and causality in the Stoic philosophy, cf. Duhot (1989: 254–65) and Wildberger (2006: I, 320–21).

impulsions of passion. By placing the emphasis on the role of an *adfectus* as the causal determinant in Oedipus' sequence of choices to run away from Corinth, Seneca stresses that it is this bad adviser that provokes ruin, and not his reason.⁴⁵ Other decisions also wrap Oedipus in responsibility for his actions and what happens in the play. Some of those acts go to his remote past: when consulting the oracle to learn the truth about his origins, was he not afraid that he would find out that he was not the true son of king Polybus? Is this not a form of vanity? Moreover, by searching to know the future ahead of time, through the prophecy of the Delphic oracle, he thus placed himself in a situation contrary to what Seneca espouses elsewhere among his writings.⁴⁶ Furthermore, Oedipus displayed unStoic arrogance, anger, and violence when he faced on the road to Thebes a man he described as a *senex* / [...] *superbus* (770–771) who had struck him with his chariot and whom he killed with one of his guards.⁴⁷

Seneca's focus on the emotional panic that over-rode Oedipus' judgement is already potent in the king's opening monologue: that panic and wilfulness have their echoes in Jocasta's reaction in the second half of the prologue and in the choral odes. The repetition can be explained only as being the dramatist's intention to insist on personal moral responsibility in the connexion of causes and so to avoid a frontal contradiction with the Stoic conception of *fatum*.⁴⁸

45 It is impossible to agree with this point in Boyle (2011: Introd., lxxx): "What value reason in a world where Oedipus' rational attempt to avoid parricide and incest actually generates them? What value virtue in a world where virtuous intent produces a moral monstrosity?" Boyle does not pay enough attention to the meaning of words denoting the passion of fear (*adfectus* of *metus*), when a Stoic author focuses on them in his drama.

46 Armisen-Marchetti (2000: 214) continues on the paradox of Seneca's attitude towards divination: "Justifiée comme jamais dans son principe cognitif, la prévision de l'avenir se retrouve dévalorisée comme jamais dans son utilité. Pour confirmation, l'absence, dans les œuvres morales de Sénèque, et tout particulièrement dans les *Lettres à Lucilius*, son journal spirituel, de toute marque d'intérêt pour la divination, alors que le thème du destin, lui, est fréquent."

47 Cf. his own narration (769–771), where he presents the confrontation in an ambiguous way, and one favorable to himself, recalling that the *superbus senex* had first thrown him from his vehicle, but without invoking legitimate defense.

48 In this way, Marti (1945: 238) is right to recall that "the story of Oedipus was frequently used by the philosophers to illustrate discussions of predestination [...]. The stress on Oedipus' freedom of choice in such discussions is significant and may have been a commonplace of the Schools, in which case Seneca's intention in his tragedy would have been immediately clear to his readers." Schetter (1972: 404–405) judges that destiny is not the "Hauptakteur des Dramas"; cp. Müller, *supra* n. 32.

The confrontation with Jocasta—although dramatically very useful—is not necessary to show that Oedipus is overwhelmed by his fears and that his attitude is unStoic and wrong, because his own monologue gives all the evidence we need. However, this confrontation is indispensable because it shows that Oedipus is able to lie, to conceal from others and from himself what he really feels and thinks inside. This aspect is crucial in order to understand the meaning of the king's reaction when he realizes that he is the murderer of Laius.

3.3 *Oedipus' Silence and Duplicity After 783*

3.3.1 A Silence After 783?

The action moves forward quickly after the fourth chorus, when Oedipus, still tormented by his bad conscience, comes back onstage to pursue the enquiry (*Curas revolvit animus et repetit metus*, 764; *redit memoria tenue per vestigium*, 768) and continues with his dialogue with Jocasta (776–783) whose re-appearance is signalled at 773–775.⁴⁹ Certainty comes to the king: *Teneo nocentem: convenit numerus, locus—/ sed tempus adde* (782–783) to which Jocasta answers precisely in a concluding half-line (*Decima iam metitur seges*, 783). The dialogue stops here, because neither one of the two characters has anything more to say.

At this moment, a new character arrives unannounced, whose first words clearly signify (*Corinthius te populus in regnum vocat*, 784) that he is a messenger sent by the Corinthians.⁵⁰ Textual contiguity of 782–783 with what follows does not imply an immediate temporal succession, nor that the dialogue is interrupted by the sudden arrival of the messenger. It is more pertinent, on the contrary, following the hypothesis proposed above in §2.2.2 (270) to consider that a consequent silence is marked after Jocasta's last response. If Seneca had wished to signal that the dialogue was suspended by the arrival of the Corinthian messenger, he would have had Oedipus or Jocasta say something similar to how the arrival of Tiresias cut short Creon's narration (*In tempore ipso sorte Phoebea excitus / Tiresia tremulo tardus accelerat genu*, but just in time, summoned by Phoebus' prophecy, Tiresias hurries here, though slowed by palsied limbs, 288–289).

49 Regarding the role of the king's guilty conscience in the dramatic progression, cf. Boyle (2011: ad 764–772): “Seneca has chosen to make Oedipus' internal anxieties the prime dramatic motor for his *anagnorisis*”; cf. Aygon (2013: 147–54) and forthcoming, esp., chap. 8, pp. 256–58.

50 On his entrance, cf. *supra* n. 27.

3.3.2 The Meaning of this Silence

This difference in the interpretation of the connection between the two scenes (silence vs broken dialogue), appears to be minor but in reality it is important. Firstly we can understand this silence as a tacit acceptance by Oedipus of his culpability in the murder of Laius.⁵¹ Because Oedipus arrives at a quasi-definitive conclusion at 782–783, he does not seem to want to pursue the matter further. He does not have any follow-up questions for the queen; rather, he narrowly focuses on the time of the murder: *sed tempus adde* (783). For him now, everything suits the narrative he has lived: the place, the number of men killed (two), the timeline culled from the last precise information given by Jocasta.⁵² He is sure (note the periphrasis *teneo nocentem*, 782) that he is Laius' killer, and therefore responsible for the plague in Thebes. Because he comes to that conclusion through a logical and factual enquiry (*numerus, locus, tempus*), led by himself, he no longer has anywhere to hide or anyone else to blame.

This silence could also reveal the double-dealing of Oedipus' attitude, who would not say anything to Jocasta about what he really thinks or feels. He uses a careful formula (*teneo nocentem*, 782), which allows him to avoid revealing the guilty person's identity. Jocasta maintains silence also: if she had heard *teneo nocentem*, why does she not question Oedipus further and right away? Perhaps, *teneo nocentem* is meant to be an aside to himself,⁵³ and *conuenit numerus, locus* are then addressed to Jocasta. This is plausible because they are connected through *sed to tempus adde* (783). However, even if *teneo nocentem* is not an aside, Jocasta's silence could mean that she does not want to know the truth, exactly as she does later, when she encourages Oedipus not to pursue

51 On silence as a sign of acceptance in Seneca's tragedies, cf. Aygon (2014a: 15–17).

52 Boyle's analysis (2011: 293, *ad* 782–783) is contestable: "This act's first Oedipus–Jocasta dialogue ends abruptly without the issue of the number of assassins being raised, allowing Oedipus to continue in a state of uncertainty as to his guilt for Laius' death." Cf. Boyle (2011: 294) on the arrival of the elder from Corinth "preventing Oedipus from raising the issue of the number of assassins and/or from firmly concluding that he is Laius' killer". But, even if the question of the number of murderers was raised here, Jocasta could have fallen back on the "official" version, previously given by Creon (*praedonum manus*, 286), which would exculpate Oedipus, and strengthen his doubts until an eventual call for witnesses to the murder of Laius. This could have been possible since only one member of the little escort (*paucos fidelis*, 779) had been killed. The fact that Oedipus does not ask any further questions about the number of killers demonstrates that he now knows the answer (one killer = himself), or that Seneca does not want to give him any additional reasons for doubt.

53 Seneca expends a considerable amount of art on his asides, both short and long; cf. Schmidt (2000) and Paré-Rey (2014b: 138–48).

his enquiry (825–836).⁵⁴ Besides, Oedipus' lack of emotional reaction is unaccountable, especially compared to Sophocles' version of the same scene.

3.3.3 Oedipus' Reaction in Greek and Roman Tragedies

The contrast with the Athenian dramatist on this point is very important because, as scholarship has tended to stress, Seneca narrowly follows Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* in the fourth act (764–881). In Sophocles, throughout the dialogue with Jocasta (697–862), Oedipus understands with quasi certainty the significance of the similarities between the circumstances of Laius' death and those in which he killed an unknown old man and his escort; this is the reason he immediately exclaims: Αἰαί, τὰδ' ἤδη διαφάνη (Alas, now all is crystal clear!, 754), which corresponds to Seneca's terse and non-committal *Teneo nocentem* (782). We can notice three important differences: first, in Sophocles, the scene takes up 166 verses, compared to only 20 verses in Seneca. Secondly, in Sophocles, Oedipus asks Jocasta immediately the origin of her information: Τίς ἦν ποτε / ὁ τοῦσδε λέξας τοὺς λόγους ὑμῖν, γύναι; (Who was it that told you this story, lady?, 754–755). There are some contradictions between Oedipus and Jocasta: he said that he killed all the members of the escort (813) and that he was alone; she states that according to a witness who survived (756) Laius was murdered one day by foreign robbers (715–716). These contradictions admit doubt about Oedipus' culpability, which will depend on what could be learned from the survivor (whose presence is judged necessary by Oedipus and Jocasta, at 765–769 and 859–862). This had already been indicated by the chorephos (until you have learned from the man who was present, have hope!, 834–835) and by Oedipus himself (so if he still gives the same number, I was not the killer, 843–844). In Seneca, on the contrary, there is nothing similar: thieves are mentioned at the beginning of Creon's narration (*praedonum manus*, 286) as a plot device to prevent Oedipus from prematurely understanding his guilt, but they are not brought up again later since Oedipus quickly realizes his own role in the murder.

Finally, in Sophocles, when Oedipus thinks that he is perhaps Laius' killer, he expresses at length and with great power the despair and moral suffering caused by his actions (813–816 and 821–823):

Εἰ δὲ τῷ ξένῳ
 τούτῳ προσήκει Λαίῳ τι συγγενές,
 τίς τοῦδέ γ' ἀνδρὸς νῦν ἔτ' ἀθλιώτερος,
 τίς ἐχθροδαίμων μᾶλλον ἂν γένοιτ' ἀνὴρ;

815

54 If Weil's correction of the *mss.* is accepted; see *supra* n. 27.

But if this foreigner
 had any tie with Laius,
 who now could be more miserable,
 who more hateful to the gods?

Λέχη δὲ τοῦ θανόντος ἐν χεροῖν ἐμαῖν 821
 χαρίνω, δι' ὧν περ ὤλετ'. ἄρ' ἔφυν κακός;
 Ἄρ' οὐχὶ πᾶς ἀναγνος;

And I am polluting the bed of the dead man with the hands
 by which he perished. Am I a criminal?
 Am I not altogether unholy?

Seneca's Oedipus keeps his silence, when we expected the contrary, since he has fewer reasons for having doubts compared to Oedipus in Sophocles. How do we understand Seneca's choice?

3.3.4 Oedipus' Complexity

Although the weight of his guilt over Laius' murder should burden him, after the dialogue with Jocasta, Oedipus insists on the purity of his hands shortly afterwards when he learned that his father Polybius had died from natural causes (790–792):

testor, licet iam tollere ad caelum pie
 puras nec ulla scelera metuentes manus.
 Sed pars magis metuenda fatorum manet.

I testify that now in good conscience I can lift my hands
 to heaven, hands that are pure and fear no crimes.
 But the great part of fate remains, needing to be feared.

The echoes with the words delivered by Sophocles' Oedipus (Am I a criminal? Am I not altogether unholy?, 822–823) underscores strongly the contrast with Seneca's character: how can he assert that he no longer fears any other *scelera*, except incest with his mother? This is a form of denial exposed by Seneca: because of the intensity of his desire for purity, a logical consequence of his guilty conscience, Oedipus leaps with such obvious relief at evidence that seems to exonerate him that he accepts it eagerly and uncritically, a wilful blindness to what was done to Laius.

What Seneca demonstrates here is the contortions and contradictions of a tormented self, with a denial similar to the one in the confrontation between

Oedipus and Jocasta in the prologue. The king's reactions would not seem to be presented as calculated cynicism, nor wilful dissimulation, even if this hypothesis cannot be excluded. Because Seneca does not give any insight into Oedipus' thoughts, he suggests that his reactions are emotional: when anxiety or accusations, such as from Apollo's oracle (233–238) or from the ghost of Laius (630–658), led him to consider he was guilty, his reason gave him arguments to resist them; when his own reason concludes he is guilty, emotionally, he cannot accept it. This conclusion is not without consequences for the political meaning of the tragedy.

3.3.5 Political Meaning of Oedipus' Ambiguity

If Seneca had used the arrival of the *senex Corinthius* to stop the king's inquiry and to prevent the two protagonists from expressing their reactions after the discovery of the high probability of Oedipus' guilt, one would be entitled to speculate that Seneca meant his audience not to be suspicious that both characters were willing to hide the truth. The manner in which Seneca manages the entrance of the *senex Corinthius*, however, indicates that Oedipus and Jocasta had already ended their dialogue. The silence is intentionally heavy and uncomfortable and longer than momentary, revealing "spectacularly" in all senses of that word more than "textually" that there is a strong temptation for the royal couple neither to accept nor to divulge the results of the enquiry. The myth does not allow the plot to take a different direction but Seneca can show the royal couple to be consciously criminal and cynical, desperate to cling to power in the face of the suffering of their people.

Thus, when the *senex Corinthius* begins to reveal to Oedipus the circumstances of his adoption and when Oedipus wants to know the truth through the testimony of an old shepherd, a witness to what happened, Jocasta recognizes the danger, but instinctively formulates her reponse in political terms: *concurrit illinc publica, hinc regis salus* (The people's wellbeing on one side is pitted against the king's wellbeing on the other, 830). In his reply to Jocasta, Oedipus at first seems willing to focus on political ramifications, and considers implicitly—and virtuously—that the situation of the city (far from a *felix status*, 833), must be taken into account (and not his personal interest), because it could not be worse: *tuto mouetur quidquid extremo in loco est* (but there is safety in changing a desperate situation, 834). Jocasta continues to insist on the *personal* dangers that he will face if he persists in his enquiry.⁵⁵ In the end, the

55 This is why, *pace* Kohn (2013: 42–43), these "répliques" fit better with Jocasta's character, even if I agree that the *senex Corinthius* has the rank of a "king's adviser": such a deep knowledge of the "political and familial situation" in Thebes would be strange from a foreigner. Besides, Kohn is wrong when he asserts (2013: 42) that Jocasta "is the model of

motivation that Oedipus claims is that he acts neither out of political considerations or from virtue but because he wants to know his “blood” (837), surely a sign of his pride:

Vel paenitendi sanguinis quaeram fidem.

Even if I have to regret it, I want certainty for my blood.

Oedipus remains ambivalent; Seneca hints that Oedipus’ final decision through which he will save his city depends on pride.

Against the standard interpretations of the *Oedipus*, some details of the dramatic language show that the protagonist has made free choices, which are led by his passionate reactions and so make him responsible for those choices, leading him towards what *fatum* foreshadowed, following the interconnexion of causes and effects which governs the world’s order. This drama constantly stresses the ethical ambiguity of the king, tortured by his bad conscience, but almost always double-dealing and conducted by his passions. Seneca demonstrates to what degree a ruler obeying his *adfectus*, among which his fears mixed with his *libido regnandi*, can be prejudicial for the city he governs—even if he is far from being an immoral and cynical tyrant such as Atreus.⁵⁶

a Roman matron, who does what she can to support her husband, but otherwise stays in the shadows”. On the contrary she speaks as a powerful queen when she admonests Oedipus with violence and almost despise (81–86), as we saw before (271–72).

56 I very much thank Stephanie Maurel and George W.M. Harrison for their precious help in translating my contribution in correct and elegant English, and the latter for pertinent suggestions.

Roman Tragedy through a Comic Lens

Niall W. Slater

Comedy and tragedy at Rome both shared festival venues and competed for public attention. Plautus and other writers of the *palliata* could both parody and pre-empt the style and scene-types (from messengers to mad scenes) of the rival genre. The success of comedy's parody of tragedy may have helped shape a more aesthetic and less emotionally identified audience reception of Roman tragedy as it became a classical canon.

Much of what we know about how Roman tragedy in the Republic looked, sounded, and moved comes to us through the eye of its sister genre, comedy. Comedy, however, was no camera, simply recording what it saw: its lens had a will of its own, though not necessarily with a single and unvarying purpose. As Sander Goldberg rightly reminds us of the whole of Roman tragedy: “the history of its art comes wrapped in the history of its reception.”¹ How comedy saw tragedy may have helped shape the reception of tragedy in subsequent centuries and even subsequent cultures.

Trying to discern the earliest stages of Roman tragedy, without the certain presence of the comic lens, is to gaze through a glass darkly. The earliest practitioners of Roman dramatic poetry wrote both tragedy and comedy. Livius Andronicus, as so often noted, wrote the first Latin play in 240 BC for the celebrations of victory in the first Punic War. It is often assumed, though nowhere stated, that this play ought to have been a tragedy,² yet without a title or scrap of verse attributable to this first play, we have no way to tell, since Livius, like his successor Naevius, worked in both genres. Even if we had one fragment of that first play, we might still not know, for unlike Greek tragedy and comedy, where the form of the verse could regularly differentiate one genre from the other, Roman tragedy and comedy deployed the same metrical vocabulary.

1 Goldberg (2007: 582).

2 So Boyle (2006: 28), relying on Cicero's use of the word *fabula* for the play in question. Some scholars assume that he produced both a tragedy and a comedy at this celebration (so *OCD*³ s.v. Livius Andronicus), but the original sources tend to speak of the “first” play, and certainly none specifies paired tragedy and comedy (Livy 7.2.8; Cicero, *Brutus* 72–73, *Tusc. Disp.* 1.3); cf. Gratwick (1982: 77–80). For a nice summary of recent debates over the significance of this “big bang” (so Gildenhard and Revermann 2010: 19) in cultural adaptation, see Gildenhard (2010: 156–60).

When texts survive as brief fragments only, it can be challenging to tell comedy and tragedy apart.

Later Romans thought they could tell tragic style when they saw it, but that stylistic sense may have had its origins in the already embedded history of Roman comedy's reception of tragedy. Aulus Gellius preserves a famous comparison of the styles of Menander and the comic playwright Caecilius, who based his *Plocium* (*Necklace*) on Menander's play of the same title. Though claiming he had admired Caecilius before undertaking the specific comparison, Gellius finds the contest in the end to be no contest. Particularly notable, however, is his evaluation of how Caecilius turns nine lines of Menander into four of his own (*Noctes Atticae* 2.21):

versus sunt hi Caecili trunca quaedam ex Menandro dicentis et consarcinantis verba tragici tumoris:

is demum infortunatus est homo,
pauper qui educit in egestatem liberos,
cui fortuna et res ut est continuo patet.
nam opulento famam facile occultat factio.

The following are the verses of Caecilius, using some maimed bits from Menander and patching in words of tragic bombast:

Not until then is the poor man truly unfortunate,
when he fathers children into want.
His fortune and situation are immediately clear.
Rumors about the rich their class easily conceals.³

Context makes relatively clear which the maimed bits of Menander are: all nine previously quoted Greek verses depict the state of the impoverished man.⁴ By elimination, therefore, the tragic bombast or inflation seems to lie in the interlaced alliteration of the last line in Caecilius.

While Horace had already laid down the principle that "comic material should not be set forth in tragic verse" (*versibus exponi tragicis res comica non vult*, *Ars Poetica* 89), *tumor* as a term of stylistic analysis comes into use

3 Translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

4 Intriguingly with a storm metaphor (χείμαζόμενος ζῆ), which Caecilius completely omits in favor of his gnomic judgment on the rich.

only in the post-Augustan period.⁵ Quintilian warns against the “the kind of speaking . . . bloated with boundless bombast” (*genus dicendi, quod . . . tumore immodico turgescit*, 12. 10. 73). By the fourth century the grammarian Evanthius, *De fabula* 3.5, praises Terence for “not overleaping into tragedy” (*ne in tragœdiam transiliret*) as Plautus and Afranius sometimes did but rather finding a golden mean:

illud quoque inter Terentianos virtutes quod eius fabulae eo sunt temperamento, ut neque extumescant ad tragicam celsitudinem neque abiciantur ad mimicam vilitatem.

Also among Terence’s virtues is the fact that his plays are of such a proportionate admixture that they neither swell to the heights of tragedy nor debase themselves to the cheapness of mime.

A hierarchy is firmly in place here: comedy may be better than mime but needs to know its place is below that of tragedy.

Was it ever thus? Before the grammarians laid down their strictures, what did Roman tragedy look like from the vantage point of the contemporary comic stage? Viewed with the certainty of hindsight or the advantage of a title indicative of genre, features such as alliteration, anaphora, elevated diction, *figura etymologica*, and general complexity seem to be the hallmarks of tragic style, but they may have been at home in the earliest comedies as well, without a specific evocation of tragedy, and only later became distinctively comedy’s version of the tragic style.⁶ Without context or contrast, it can be virtually impossible to tell whether a small example of this style is inherently tragic or comic. The late writer Censorinus, for example, in his work on meter preserves as examples of verse types some anonymous lines that would do equally well as tragedy or comic parody of tragedy (168–170 *TrRF adespota* = 147–149W; Censorinus, *GL* 6. 614.7–13 K):⁷

quae tam terribilis tua pectora turbat, terrifico sonitu inpulit?

What sound so terrible disturbs your heart, attacks with terrifying resonance?

5 There may be a specific tragic connection through the metaphor of the ὄγκος of the tragic mask (Pollux 4.133).

6 For which see, for example, Fraenkel (2007: 141, 234–42) and Goldberg (1986: 205–11).

7 Text after *TrRF* I Schauer fr. 168–170 (in Ehlers et al., 2012). Where possible, fragments are also cited by the numbers in Warmington (1935).

quis meum nominans nomen exciet?
quis tumultu invocans incolarum fidem...?

Who rousts me out, naming my name?
Who, invoking the inhabitants' aid with uproar...?

The first titubates with Ennian energy,⁸ the latter two play with both alliteration and *figura etymologica*, but as Warmington notes, these could be equally well be comic versions of tragedy.

A title or even a hint of action can show the playwright framing the tragic style through a comic lens. In Naevius's *Gymnasticus* ("The Gym-Rat"; fr. 55W *apud* Nonius 95.26) someone describes how:

saxa, silvas, lapides, montes dissicis dispulveras

rocks, forests, pebbles, peaks you pulverize into powder

Without the play title, we might assume that the person addressed with such additive alliteration genuinely possessed divine powers, but in a play called *Gymnasticus*, whether the line is spoken to the title character or not, the addressee is unlikely to be a god. So too in Livius Andronicus's *Ludius* ("The Performer"; fr. 2W *apud* Festus 488.32), when someone is described thus:

corrui quasi ictus scena, haut multo secus

He fell as if struck by a priest's ax—well, not much different.

The title (designating not necessarily an actor, but some kind of performer in a public *ludus*) forms an important part of our interpretive frame. The first half of the line might just be a metaphor, but the specificity of *scena* (here the archaic word for the ax belonging to a *pontifex*) combined with the slight equivocation in the second half suggests a more commonplace event is being sent up with tragic-sounding grandiloquence.

While almost all Roman tragedy is set in a world of myth, and borrowed Greek myth at that,⁹ even a clearly mythical allusion is not a certain guarantor that a given passage stems from tragedy, rather than comedy's view of tragedy. Cicero, for example, in discussing metaphor quotes a verse where someone

8 Cf. the (in)famous *Annales* fr. 104: *O Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti*.

9 On the non-mythic *fabula praetexta*, see Manuwald 2001.

declares his intention to avoid the fate of the Greek fleet returning from Troy (*de Oratore* III.41.166; fr. 159–160W= TrRF I Schauer *adespota* fr. 23):

neque me patiar
iterum ad unum scopulum ut olim classem Achivom offendere.

Nor shall I allow myself
to be dashed again upon the same rock, as once the Achaean fleet did.

If this is actually a tragic speaker, the wording implies a temporal as well as intellectual distance from the events: it might be from a play whose events follow the war, when the fate of the Achaean fleet was already well-known. Given that Cicero quotes this as an example of metaphor, however, a comic speaker inflating the significance of her/his own choices may perhaps be more likely possibility.

In many ways, it is only when we turn to the complete plays of Plautus¹⁰ and to a much lesser extent Terence that we can gain a larger, though undoubtedly distorted view of Roman tragedy, especially in performance. Comedy regularly shared festival venues with the other genre, and the comic playwrights of the second and third generation quite reasonably regarded tragedy as both rival and resource.

The occasions for performance in the Republic, however, were never so rigidly organized that the audience would know for certain “if it’s day two, it must be tragedy.”¹¹ A question worth raising, even for the second generation of Roman theatre audiences, is how clear their generic expectations were when they came to a performance. We have no evidence, as we do for Athens, for a festival structure that always placed tragedy at one point in the program, comedy in another. For the more sophisticated audience members, of course, titles would be important clues (as they have been for us as later readers): an *Asinaria* or *Mostellaria* would always sound like comedies—but what about an *Amphitruo*? We do not even know how or when the original Republican audience would have learned the title of the play on offer that day. Plautus seems to play with the audience’s generic and performative expectations in more than one of his plays. One obvious example is the *Poenulus* prologue, which begins:

10 Still very useful and succinct is Gratwick (1982: 133–36).

11 As Harrison (this volume, p. 370) notes: “There was never at Rome, either in the Republic or Empire, a tradition of staging multiple tragedies or comedies in a row.” Cf. the schematic comparison of performance occasions at Athens versus Rome in Gildenhard (2010: 165).

Achillem Aristarchi mihi commentari lubet:
ind' mihi principium capiam, ex ea tragoedia,
"sileteque et tacete atque animum advortite,
audire iubet vos imperator" . . . histricus.¹²

I feel like performing Aristarchus's *Achilles*:
that's where I'll take my start, from that tragedy:
"Be silent, be still, and give heed;
To hear is the order of your general"—stage manager.

The prologue announces that he is in the mood to perform a tragedy, the *Achilles*, almost certainly Ennius's Latin version of the Greek play of Aristarchus.¹³ Depending on how the actor plays the lines, his rising tricolon of imperatives and alliteration could leave the audience wondering if they are in fact in for a tragedy—until he arrives at *histricus*, and the misquotation turns it into the first joke on the audience, who should now be relieved to be in the right place. A very lengthy prologue follows, tossing in lots more reassuring jokes before detailing the play's extensive backstory.

By Plautus's day, the Roman audience was doubtless as well acquainted with divine prologues in comedy as they were for tragedy. The appearance of a divine prologue to open Plautus's tale of seaside salvation, the *Rudens*, would not therefore in and of itself have seemed a send-up of tragic style or convention—unless Alison Sharrock is right to suggest that the prologue-speaker may have appeared "on high" (on the roof of the stage building), at least at the beginning of his address.¹⁴ The arriving divinity is novel, however (the star Arcturus, with something about his costume or mask representing him as a star, line 3), and his narrative novel as well (*Rudens* 1–7):

{Arc.} qui gentis omnis mariaque et terras movet,
eius sum civis civitate caelitum.

12 Texts of Plautus after de Melo's Loeb edition, except where noted, although I write consonantal v.

13 See on the prologue as a whole Slater 1992 (with further references) and esp. 135–37. While the reference to the Greek tragedian Aristarchus might suggest a reference preserved from the Greek source of the *Poenulus*, as recently Fontaine (2009: 191), the joke is very likely to fall flat without a recent Roman referent in the audience's experience. Cf. also Henderson (1999: 6–7).

14 Sharrock (2009: 208; 205–210 on the prologue generally). Blänsdorf (1993: 57) suggests that 48% of the *Rudens* is parody—though not all of tragedy.

ita sum ut videtis: splendens stella candida,
 signum quod semper tempore exoritur suo
 hic atque in caelo. nomen Arcturo est mihi. 5
 noctu sum in caelo clarus atque inter deos,
 inter mortalis ambulo interdus.

{Arc.} I am a citizen of that celestial city, ruled by one
 Who moves all nations, seas, and lands.
 I am as you see: glittering with a bright star,
 a sign that always rises in its own season
 here and in heaven. My name is Arcturus. 5
 By night I shine in the heavens and among the gods,
 among mortals I walk by day.

Where other Plautine prologues work to warm up the audience and establish a reciprocity through various kinds of jokes, Arcturus seems pretty much all business: a citizen of the celestial city (2), a servant of the *imperator* of gods and men, Jupiter (9), working by night among the gods in heaven and strolling among men on earth by day (7). Even when he gets around to detailing the background to the play, attributing it to Diphilus (32, a solid generic marker for those in the audience who recognize the Greek comic playwright's name),¹⁵ there are still no overt jokes: instead, we learn the complicated plot of an exiled Athenian father, his lost and enslaved daughter, the pimp who is trying to take her away, and the young man who is in love with her—all brought together again on this shore by Arcturus, who raised a storm at sea to prevent the pimp's escape. When after 82 lines he finally exits, the audience who came to hear a comedy of Plautus may well be wondering if they have come to the right performance. Only with the appearance of a slave do we finally hear anything resembling a joke—and it is a remarkably metatheatrical one:

{Sce.} pro di immortales, tempestatem quoius modi
 Neptunus nobis nocte hac misit proxuma!
 detexit ventus villam. quid verbis opust? 85
 non ventus fuit, verum Alcumena Euripidi,
 ita omnis de tecto deturbavit tegulas;

15 It may only be coincidence, but a century later Diphilus was commemorated, presumably as a representative of comedy, with a statue whose inscribed base survives at the theatre of Tusculum (cf. Harrison, this volume, p. 380).

{Sce.} By the immortal gods, what a storm
 Neptune hit us with last night!
 The wind unroofed the house—why say more?
 That was no wind, it was really Euripides' Alcmene—
 it blew every tile off the roof!

The lens of comedy focuses on the inherent bombast and noisiness of tragedy: it reminds the audience of a production they may well have seen quite recently on stage, a Latin version of Euripides.¹⁶ Sceledrus's joke may also work on another level, implying that the prologue speaker the audience has just listened to was as much of a blowhard as one would find in tragedy!¹⁷ This technique allows Plautus to lay out the emotionally affecting elements of his story, then make a joke of them—without erasing their original effect on the audience.

Another Plautus play makes an even stronger bid to rival the emotional impact of tragedy, while retaining comic characters and style. The prologue speaker for the *Captivi* has a difficult balancing act to pull off, because he enters a stage on which two chained captives are already standing, a powerful visual signal that this is not a typical comedy and might well turn into something else. The uncharacterized prologue speaker must therefore interlace his earlier exposition of the story with banter and jokes about people still finding their seats, but near the end of his speech, he is at pains to reassure the audience, who may still be puzzling over what kind of a play they are in for, that it is still worth their attention (54–59):

profecto expediet fabulae huic operam dare:
 non pertractate facta est neque item ut ceterae: 55
 neque spurcidici insunt versus immemorabiles;
 hic neque periurus leno est nec meretrix mala
 neque miles gloriosus; ne vereamini
 quia bellum Aetolis esse dixi cum Aleis:
 foris illi extra scaenam fient proelia. 60
 nam hoc paene iniquom est, comico choragio
 conari desubito agere nos tragoediam.

¹⁶ So Fraenkel (2007: 50–51); cf. Sonnenschein (1914) and Lefevre (2006: 66).

¹⁷ Fraenkel (1942) ascribes the entirety of the concept of Arcturus as prologue figure, including his surprisingly literate and bureaucratic activities of writing down the deeds and misdeeds of men, to Diphilus. If so, Plautus's treatment suggests he found the character as much a tragic prologue as a comic one.

It'll definitely pay to pay attention to this play:
 it's not written in standard style or just like the rest:
 no smutty verses or ones you can't repeat;
 here's no lying pimp or whore with a heart of lead,
 no bragging soldier. Don't be afraid because
 I said the Aetolians were at war with the Eleans:
 the battles will be fought offstage over there.
 It would be really wrong for us, dressed for a comedy,
 suddenly to try staging a tragedy.

The prologue speaker has been seeking to stretch the audience's expectations for the play in terms of theme and subject matter, but the reassurance he offers at the end of his speech, the proof that they are going to see a comedy after all, lies in the features of the performance they can already see: the *comico chora-gio*, the costumes and any other stage props that say "comedy."¹⁸

The reassurance may be needed, since Tyndarus, slave to Philocrates before both were captured in this war, takes over the latter's role in order to facilitate his escape and, when discovered, suffers the worst punishment actually enacted within the plot of a Roman comedy.¹⁹ Philocrates' return not only ransoms Tyndarus but reveals him to be the long-lost son of their captor Hegio. In ring-compositional fashion the epilogue returns to the issue of just what kind of comedy this play is (1033–1034):

huius modi paucas poetae reperiunt comoedias,
 ubi boni meliores fiant.

Poets discover few plays of this kind,
 where the good become better.

Sharrock very intriguingly has suggested that the "*meliores fiant*" may echo Aristotle's views on tragedy as a representation of those nobler than ourselves.²⁰ Even if we doubt that Plautus read the *Poetics* directly, the notion that

18 For further on the competition of tragic and comic modes, especially in the ending of *Captivi*, cf. Frangoulidis (1996).

19 As he reports on his return: *vidi ego multa saepe picta, quae Accherunti fierent / cruciamenta, verum enim vero nulla adaeque est Accheruns / atque ubi ego fui, in lapicidinibus* (I've often seen depicted the torments of Acheron, but there's truly no Acheron equal to where I was, in the stone quarries, 998–1000).

20 Cf. Sharrock (2009: 258–73) on plays ending with a "moral" in relation to tragic paradigms, esp. pp. 260–62 on *Captivi* and Aristotle *Poetics* 1448a.

he intended a challenge to tragedy's exclusive claims over an audience is very appealing.

Specific tragic type scenes show up in the mirror of comedy as well, notably the tragic messenger speech. Yet the degree of tragic style here is not uniform: Plautus can use a touch of the tragic manner for moments of seeming seriousness, or exaggerate to such a degree that laughter can be the only response. The servant Sosia, returned from battle in the *Amphitruo*, begins his narrative thus (186–189):

{Sos.} quod numquam opinatus fui neque alius quisquam civium
sibi eventurum, id contigit, ut salvi poteremur domi.
victores victis hostibus legiones reveniunt domum,
duello extincto maxumo atque internecatis hostibus.

{Sos.} What neither I nor any other of the citizens thought
would befall them, that has occurred: we've safely regained our home.
Conquerors of the conquered enemy, our legions return home,
the great war done, and the enemy undone.

The rhetoric is formal, the cadence dignified, but the alliteration and assonance relatively light, with a few touches of distinctly elevated vocabulary. When the servant Bromia appears much later to report the startling events of Hercules' birth, the tragic temperature rises more than a few degrees (1053–1056):

{Bro.} spes atque opes vitae meae iacent sepultae in pectore,
neque ulla est confidentia iam in corde, quin amiserim;
ita mi videntur omnia, mare, terra, caelum, consequi
iam ut opprimar, ut enicer. me miseram, quid agam nescio.

{Bro.} The hope and health of my life lie buried in my breast,
nor is there any surety now in my heart that I've not lost all;
so all seems to pursue me—sea, earth, sky—
to obliterate, to slaughter me. Wretched me, I know not what to do.

The assonances of 1053, the asyndeton of 1055 elevate the tone above the level of Sosia's dispatch from the field, but more will depend on the style employed by the actor. Bromia's only audience is the one in the theatre, since *Amphitruo* himself lies thunderstruck on stage, unconscious until she revives him. Perhaps one clue for the exaggeration of both language and performance mode here in

this opening lies in the deflating effect of Bromia's comment just a couple lines later: *aquam velim* (I need some water" 1058).

For serious chewing of the scenery, however, there is little to top the arrival of the maid Pardalisca on stage in the *Casina* to announce the dread deeds inside the house. The audience has been carefully alerted to the idea that this is part of a scheme to terrify the lecherous *senex* of the play, Lysidamus (621–624):

nulla sum, nulla sum, tota, tota occidi,
cor metu mortuom est, membra miserae tremunt,
nescio unde auxili, praesidi, perfugi
mi aut opum copiam comparem aut expetam:

I am naught, I am naught, slaughtered, slaughtered all,
dead the heart within me, wretched, my limbs shake,
I know not where to go for aid, succor, sanctuary,
or whence to gather or to seek sufficiency of help.

On one level this is an archetypal cry of tragic despair: one might easily compare the soliloquy of the miser Euclio in the *Aulularia* when he discovers his gold is gone: *perii, interii, occidi. quo curram? quo non curram?* (I'm dead, I'm done, I'm slain! Where to run? Where not to run?, 713).²¹ Pardalisca's outcry, however, morphs into both narrative and (p)re-enactment. After pretending to faint in old Lysidamus's arms, she reports that the young girl Casina, fearing her forced marriage, has gone off her head with stress and grief and stalks the house with a sword, threatening "to kill the man she will sleep with tonight" (*occisurum eum hac nocte quicum cubaret*, 671). The "real" Casina famously never appears in the play, only a male slave disguised as Casina in the plot to humiliate Lysidamus. In Plautus's carefully complicated plot Pardalisca one-ups tragedy as she brilliantly exploits Lysidamus's fears in the course of what we might call a mad scene by proxy.²²

Comedy's Madnesses

"Hieronymo's mad againe."

THOMAS KYD, *The Spanish Tragedy*

21 Cf. Sharrock (2009: 198–99) on the tragic style here. Bianco (2006: 63–65) hears parallels to Ennius, particularly his *Medea Exul* (*exanimata eliminat*, fr. 263W, following Nonius 38.29; *TrRF* II Manuwald 96 gives *exanimata<m> eliminat*; cf. *Cas.* 630, *exanimata exsiluit*).

22 On tragedy in the *Casina*, cf. Andrews (2004).

Dr. Rance: "Why are there so many doors? Was the house designed by a lunatic?"

Dr. Prentice: "Yes. We have him here as a patient from time to time."

JOE ORTON, *What the Butler Saw*

The Roman dramatists found one type of scene archetypal for the tragic genre and irresistible to the competing genre of comedy: the mad scene. In characteristically metatheatrical fashion, however, no actual madmen take the comic stage, but only those who, like Shakespeare's Hamlet, "put an antic disposition on."

Plautus's *Mercator* offers an exemplary study in the use of both tragedy in general and madness in particular for comic ends. The play is built around the travails of the leading young man, Charinus, who appears as a characterized prologue and tells his audience, among other things, that the play has a Greek original behind it (9–10):

Graece haec vocatur Ἐμπορος Philemonis,
eadem Latine Mercator Macci Titi.

In Greek this play's called the *Emporos* of Philemon;
in Latin it's the *Merchant* of Titus Maccius.

When, at the end, the play turns to an extended parody or re-working of the tragic story of the Greek hero Teucer, it seems likely that there was at least some hint of this in the original plot of Philemon. At the same time, sufficiently pointed echoes of fragments of Pacuvius's Roman tragedy, *Teucer*, make it highly likely that Plautus has at least underscored and probably significantly increased the use of tragic language and tonality here. I therefore leave aside here specific questions about the exact elements of the Philemonian plot and seek to look through the reconstructed eyes of a Roman audience at the play we have, and beyond to the world of Roman tragedy as that audience might have experienced it.

As the *Mercator* begins, Charinus has just returned from an overseas trip with the girl he has purchased for himself. He is, however, still pretending she is a slave to conceal the situation from his father. The father, smitten at first sight of the girl, arranges for the concealed purchase of her for himself. Charinus, thinking her lost for good, decides to leave Athens again in despair and appears on stage, dressed for departure, with this monologue (830–841):

limen superum<que> inferumque, salve, simul autem vale: 830
hunc hodie postremum extollo mea domo patria pedem.

usus, fructus, victus, cultus iam mihi harunc aedium
 interemptust, interfectust, alienatust. occidi!
 di Penates meum parentum, familiai Lar pater,
 vobis mando meum parentum rem bene ut tutemini. 835
 ego mihi alios deos Penatis persequar, alium Larem,
 aliam urbem, aliam civitatem: ab Atticis abhorreo;
 nam ubi mores deteriores increbrescunt in dies,
 ubi qui amici, qui infideles sint nequeas pernoscere
 ubique id eripiaturo animo tuo quod placeat maxume, 840
 ibi quidem si regnum detur, non cupita est civitas.

Doorframe on high and below, at once hail and farewell:
 This day I extricate my last step from my father's house.
 Use, enjoyment, vittles and skittles of these halls for me are now
 abrogated, abolished, and alienated. I'm dead!
 Household gods of my fathers, father Lar of the family,
 to you I commend my parental estate: watch it well.
 As for me, other household gods I'll follow, another Lar,
 another city, another country: Attica I abhor.
 Where the habits of the heart grower direr daily,
 where friends and foes can't be differentiated,
 where your heart is robbed of its dearest desire,
 there even if dominion were offered, I would not desire to dwell.

Friedrich Leo, followed by Tenney Frank, recognized in this speech a clear parody of Roman tragedy and indeed more particularly Pacuvius's lost *Teucer*.²³ While references to the Penates and Lares (834–836) tie the speech to a specifically Roman context, Charinus's later announcement that he will go into exile in Cyprus (*in Cyprum recta, quandoquidem pater mihi exilium parat*, "straight to Cyprus, since my father prepares exile for me," 933) makes the direct connection to the story of Teucer. Indeed, the notion of the father exiling the son fits *only* the tragic situation of Teucer: in onstage Athens, Charinus's father does not even know his son plans to skip town.²⁴

The tragic style as well as the Roman coloration are laid on very thick here from the beginning. Scholars note the *Romanitas* of the apostrophe to the

23 Leo (1912²: 134); Frank (1932). See importantly now also Augoustakis (2010); my discussion here of the *Mercator* is deeply indebted to his work.

24 Nor does Charinus know that his father has bought the girl for himself, as both Frank (1932: 245 n. 5) and Augoustakis (2010: 82–83) point out.

personified threshold (*limen superum inferumque*),²⁵ though perhaps not the bathos of its specificity: does one really need to bid farewell to the upper door-frame as well as the lower? Asyndeton, homoioteleuton, and alliteration (*usus, fructus, victus, cultus; interemptust, interfectust, alienatust; postremum . . . patria pedem . . . penates . . . parentum . . . pater*) tumble over one another in quick succession. Augoustakis even suggests that the string of verbs in *Mercator* 833 (*interemptust, interfectust, alienatust*) might particularly echo *lacerasti orbasti exstinxti* in a preserved fragment of Pacuvius's *Teucer*:²⁶

segregare abs te ausu's aut sine illo Salamina ingredi
neque paternum aspectum es veritus . . .
 quom aetate exacta indigem
liberum lacerasti orbasti exstinxti, neque fratris necis
neque eius gnati parvi, qui tibi in tutelam est traditus
Pacuvius, *Teucer* fr. 345–349W (fr. 243 Schierl)

You dared to separate [Ajax] from yourself or to tread Salamis without him,
and you did not fear your father's face . . .
 when you mangled, despoiled, annihilated
him, bereft of his children, and neither for the death of your brother
nor his little son, who was handed over into your safe-keeping

Charinus, however, is not merely content to speak in tragic style. Not only is he dressed for the part of one going on a journey; metatheatrically, he proposes to play all the parts (including that of the horse!) as he sets out (*Mercator* 851–856):

{Char.} apparatus sum ut videtis: abicio superbiam;
egomet mihi comes, calator, equos, agaso, armiger,
egomet sum mihi imperator, idem egomet mihi oboedio,
egomet mihi fero quod usust. o Cupido, quantus es!
nam tu quemvis confidentem facile tuis factis facis,
eundem ex confidente actutum diffidentem denuo. 855

25 Augoustakis (2010: 81). On *limen* as a particularly tragic lexical choice, cf. Karakasis (2005: 93–94).

26 Cicero, *de orat.* 11.46.193. Cf. Augoustakis (2010: 83).

{Char.} I am decked as you see: down with my pride.
 I am mine own comrade, crier, steed, stable-boy, armor-bearer,
 I am general to myself, myself the one I obey.
 I bear for myself what is of use. O Cupid, how great thou art!
 You make any man you please mighty by your deeds,
 then the same man from mighty at once again into a mouse.

Apart from the nice irony of claiming to cast aside his pride even as he constantly says *egomet*, a shift even within tragic style is taking place here: Charinus no longer sounds like a hopeless exile but an entire military expedition, from general to foot soldier, all wrapped into one, as he seems destined to fight against Cupid.

The moment his companion Eutyclus arrives on stage and hails him, however, and moreover specifically promising him victory, Charinus immediately reverts to despair (*Mercator* 867–871):

{Char.} qui me revocat? {Eut.} Spes, Salus, Victoria.
 {Char.} quid me voltis? EVT. ire tecum. {Char.} alium comitem quaerite,
 non amittunt hi me comites qui tenent. {Eut.} qui sunt ei?
 {Char.} cura, miseria, aegritudo, lacrumae, lamentatio. 870
 {Eut.} repudia istos comites atque huc respice et revortere.

{Char.} Who bids me back? Eut. Hope, Health, Victory.
 Char. What would you with me? Eut. To go with you. Char. Seek ye another comrade, my comrades here hold me and do not let me go. Eut. Who are these?
 Char. Sorrow, suffering, sickness, weeping, wailing.
 Eut. Cast off those comrades: look back, turn back.

Augoustakis intriguingly suggests that, for those in the audience who remember Telamon's ringing renunciation of his son Teucer in Pacuvius's production, Eutyclus's appeal to his friend is both poetic parody and inversion of parental power:²⁷

te repudio nec recipio, naturam <ab>dico: facesse!

I cast you off and receive you not; I renounce your birth; depart!

PACUVIUS, *Teucer* fr. 342W (fr. 244 Schierl)²⁸

27 Augoustakis (2010: 81).

28 Nonius 306. 32.

Where Telemon casts off his son (*repudio*), his friend bids Charinus cast off (*repudia*) despair and return to his parental household. Charinus, however, has already pivoted from one man military expedition to band of batty brothers: where moments before he was himself the only companion he needed (*egomet mihi comes*, 852), now he claims to be bound to his comrade afflictions (870).

Charinus then seems to realize a need to up the ante. While remaining in the tragic mode, Charinus shifts from tragic tones of farewell to hallucination, that is, to a mad scene. In fact, it may be his friend Eutychus who drives him into a world of fantasy (872–879):

{Char.} siquidem mecum fabulari vis, supsequere. {Eut.} sta ilico.	872
sta ilico, <nam> amicus <nunc> aduenio multum beneuolens.	887
{Char.} male facis properantem qui me commorare. sol abit.	873
{Eut.} si huc item properes ut istuc properas, facias rectius:	
huc secundus ventus nunc est; cape modo vorsorium	875
hic favonius serenust, istic auster imbricus;	
hic facit tranquillitatem, iste omnis fluctus conciet.	
recipe te ad terram, Charine, huc. nonne ex advorso vides	
nubis atra imberque <ut> instat?	

{Char.} If you want a confab with me, follow along. Eut. Stop there, stop there, I'm coming to you now as your best buddy.
 Char. You're wronging me, delaying me when I'm in a rush. The sun's setting.
 Eut. If you were hurrying this way as you're now hurrying that, you'd do better:
 Now the wind's setting this way: just trim your sail:
 here's the gentle zephyr, there's the torrential south wind.
 This one makes the glassy sea, that one rouses every wave.
 Betake yourself back to land, Charinus, hither. Don't you see
 opposite you, how black cloud and rain lower?

The key here may be Charinus's question at 872 and the force of *mecum fabulari vis*. Does he mean to invite Eutychus along on the expedition or in fact to join him in his fantasy (*fabula*)? It is Eutychus who introduces the storm imagery for his friend's emotional distress, imagery that certainly has parallels if not specific echoes in what was clearly a famous storm description in Pacuvius's *Teucer*:

... profectioe laeti piscium lasciviam
 intuemur nec tuendi capere satietas potest.
 Interea prope iam occidente sole inhorrescit mare,
 tenebrae conduplicantur, noctisque et nimbium obcaecat nigror;
 flamma inter nubes coruscat, caelum tonitru contremuit,
 grando mixta imbri largifico subita praecipitans cadit,
 undique omnes venti erumpunt, saevi existunt turbines,
 fervit aestu pelagus.

PACUVIUS, *Teucer* fr. 353–360W (fr. 239 Schierl)²⁹

Happy in our departure, we gazed at the fish playing
 nor could we have enough of looking.
 Meanwhile just as the sun set the sea grew rough,
 shadows doubled, and the black of night and storms blinded us.
 Flame flickered within the clouds, the heavens shook with thunder,
 sudden hail mixed with masses of rain fell headlong,
 gales burst forth everywhere, fierce whirlwinds arose,
 the sea boiled with waves.

Eutychus insists that he knows where Charinus's girlfriend is and gradually lures him back from the storm in his mind (*quid si mi animus fluctuat?*, what if my mind is storm-tossed?, 890) to the safe harbor of home. His tragic performance seems to end both verbally and visually when he casts off his travelling garb (*ornatum hunc*, 910) and calls for his domestic cloak from within (*pallium*, 911).

A good mad scene deserves an encore, and when Eutychus at first is unwilling to take Charinus immediately to his girlfriend, Charinus demands his travelling cloak, belt, and sword again and out of his own imagination calls up a chariot (931–933):

{Char.} ... iam in currum escendi, iam lora in manus cepi meas.
 {Eut.} sanus non es. {Char.} quin, pedes, vos in curriculum conicitis
 in Cyprum recta, quandoquidem pater mihi exilium parat?

{Char.} ... now I mount my chariot, now take my reins in hand.
 {Eut.} You're not sane. {Char.} Feet, why don't you hurl me on the course
 straight to Cyprus, since my father prepares exile for me?

29 Cicero, *de div.* 1.14.24 and Cicero, *de orat.* 3.39.157.

The tragic parody is even broader than before, as Charinus first proposes to drive across the sea to Cyprus (perhaps a send-up of a marine thiasos of Venus?) and then apostrophizes his feet as the means of getting there. Only when Eutychus promises to bring Charinus directly to his girlfriend Pasicompsa does Charinus return from his Cypriot hallucination by more “sensible” means (946–947):

{Char.} navem conscendo, proficiscor ilico. iam sum domi,
iam redii <ex> exilio.

{Char.} I'm boarding the ship, I'm setting out from there. Now I'm home,
now I've returned from exile.

Ultimately, Charinus's tragic pretensions serve only to divert and delay: he is no tragic hero but a comic *adulescens amans*. Thus there is no place, even in inverted form, in the comic version of this play for perhaps the most famous line of Pacuvius's *Teucer* (though it curiously had a comic antecedent as well):³⁰

patria est, ubicumque est bene

One's homeland is wherever all is well.

PACUVIUS, *Teucer* fr. 380W (fr. 250 Schierl)

Perhaps it lies deeply beneath the question Eutychus poses when Charinus first talks of going into exile: *quae patria aut domus tibi stabilis esse poterit?* (What homeland or home can ever be fixed for you?, 653).

To see what a strong comic hero can do with tragic madness, we must turn to the multiple character disorders of Plautus's *Menaechmi*. The confusion of identity in this play quickly raises the question of who is sane and who not. Within 70 lines of arriving on stage, the visiting Menaechmus II from Syracuse is accosted by the cook Cylindrus and addressed as though he were the man who had hired him to prepare dinner (*Menaechmi* 287–293):³¹

{Cyl.} Menaechme, numero huc advenis ad prandium.
nunc opsonatu redeo. {Men. II} responde mihi,
adulescens: quibus hic pretiis porci veneunt
sacres sinceri? {Cyl.} nummis. {Men. II} nummum a me accipe: 290

30 Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 5.37.108 is our source. Warmington *ad loc.* notes the parallel at Aristophanes, *Wealth* 1151, when Hermes says: πατρις γάρ ἐστι παῖς 'ὅν ἄν πρᾶττη τις εὔ.

31 Although following de Melo's Latin text, I here use the character designation Menaechmus II for the twin from Syracuse, rather than de Melo's Sosicles.

iube te piari de mea pecunia.
 nam equidem insanum esse te certo scio,
 qui mihi molestus homini ignoto quisquis es.

{Cyl.} Menaechmus, you've arrived early for lunch.
 I'm just now back from shopping. {Men.} Tell me,
 young man: what price are pure sacrificial pigs
 selling for here? {Cyl.} One sesterce. {Men.} Take a sesterce from me:
 get yourself purified with my money.
 I know for sure you're out of your mind:
 you're bothering me, a man you've never met, whoever you are.

Menaechmus II's instantly aggressive response sounds itself a little cracked at first (what price sacred pigs?, 289) but using the other's one word answer as a springboard turns it into an immediate accusation that the cook is the crazy one.³²

When the father-in-law of the local, Epidamnian Menaechmus I comes to investigate his daughter's claims of ill-treatment, Menaechmus II with a curse on himself denies knowing the old man, prompting this outburst (*Menaechmi* 818–819):

{Sen.} sanus es qui istuc exoptes aut neges te umquam pedem
 in eas aedis intulisse ubi habitas, insanissime?

{Sen.} Are you sane? You're wishing this or denying you ever
 set foot in this very house where you live, you lunatic?

In masked performance there is of course no way to change a performer's facial appearance or expression other than by language. The wife's description of Menaechmus II's reactions become the source of his own improvisational plot (*Menaechmi* 828–831):

{Mat.} viden tu illi<c> oculos virere? ut viridis exoritur colos
 ex temporibus atque fronte, ut oculi scintillant, vide! 829–830
 {Men. II} ei mihi, insanire me aiunt, ultra quom ipsi insaniunt. 843

32 It is a superb power move. Though not strictly parallel, I am reminded of John Housman's wonderful (though economically dated) line in *The Paper Chase*: "Here is a dime. Call your mother. Tell her there's serious doubt about your becoming a lawyer."

quid mihi meliust quam, quando illi me insanire
 praedicant, 831
 ego med assimulem insanire, ut illos a me apsterream?

{Mat.} Do you see his eyes turning green there? The green color
 is spreading from his temples and forehead, his eyes are
 flashing: look!
 {Men.} Oh me, they say I'm crazy, when they're the really crazy ones.
 Since they claim I'm crazy, what's a better plan for me
 than *pretending* to be crazy, to scare them away from me?

The mad scene he proceeds to improvise is a mash-up of several kinds of derangement, from Bacchic frenzy to oracular command. Like a bacchant, he seems to see his persecutors as animals, rather than humans (*Menaechmi* 835–839):

{Men. 11} euhoe Bacche, Bromie, quo me in silvam venatum vocas? 835
 audio, sed non abire possum ab his regionibus,
 ita illa me ab laeva rabiosa femina asservat canes,
 poste autem ille Cercops alius, qui saepe aetate in sua
 perdidit civem innocentem falso testimonio.

{Men.} Aiee! Bacchus, Bromius, where do you call me to hunt in the
 forest?
 I hear you, but I can't escape these regions:
 that rabid bitch so hems me in on the left,
 and that other monkey from behind: in his day he often
 ruined an innocent citizen with perjured testimony.

Then he claims direct orders from Apollo, first to drive the wife from the stage (*Menaechmi* 840–842):

{Men. 11} ecce, Apollo mi ex oraclo imperat 840
 ut ego illi oculos exuram lampadibus ardentibus.
 {Mat.} perii! mi pater, minatur mihi oculos exurere.

{Men.} Behold, Apollo's oracle commands me
 to burn out her eyes with flaming torches.
 {Mat.} I'm done for, daddy, he's threatening to burn out my eyes.

and then with that accomplished to attack her father with an ax (*Menaechmi* 857–858):

{Men. II} faciam quod iubes; securim capiam ancipitem atque hunc senem osse fini dedolabo assulatim viscera.

{Men.} I'll do as you order; I shall seize the double-headed ax and filet the flesh from this old man bit by bit, down to the bone.

The actor doubtless creates these tragic stage properties out of language and gesture, becoming first a Fury³³ and then perhaps Clytemnestra herself.³⁴ Then he conjures up a whole chariot and team with which to ride down his opponents, becoming as much an epic as a tragic hero (*Menaechmi* 862–868):

{Men. II} multa mi imperas, Apollo: nunc equos iunctos iubes
capere me indomitos, ferocis, atque in currum inscendere,
ut ego hunc proteram leonem vetulum, olentem, edentulum.
iam astiti in currum, iam lora teneo, iam stimulum: in manu est. 865
agite equi, facitote sonitus unguarum appareat
cursu celeri; facite in flexu sit pedum pernicitas.
{Sen.} mihin equis iunctis minare?

{Men.} You mandate many things to me, Apollo: now you command me to yoke my steeds, untamed, wild, and mount my chariot, so that I may run over this ancient, odoriferous, toothless lion. Now I stand in my chariot, now hold the reins, now the whip: it's in my hand.

33 For Furies, regularly represented with snakes and sometimes with torches, as generic markers of tragedy, see briefly Taplin (2007: 40–41 and 60) on a 4th century pelike from Perugia, with Orestes and Furies, for example. As Taplin notes, Greek comedy had already framed the Fury as a marker for both tragedy and madness. Bleepyrus in Aristophanes' *Wealth* 423–424 suggests that the goddess Poverty looks like a refugee from tragedy: "Ἴσως Ἐρινὺς ἐστὶν ἐκ τραγωδίας / βλέπει γέ τοι μανικὸν τι καὶ τραγωδικόν." (Perhaps she's a Fury out of tragedy: she looks like something crazed and tragic.)

34 Clytemnestra appears with her ax, killing Cassandra, on a red figure cup of the Marlay painter (ARV² 1280. 64, circa 430 BC) in the Museo Archeologico, Ferrara.

Go, my steeds: make the ring of your hooves sound forth
 in swift flight: make haste in flexing your fetlocks.
 Old Man. Are you threatening me with yoked steeds?

Menaechmus II feigns an attack on the old man, then a sudden reverse:
 (*Menaechmi* 870–871):

{Men. II} sed quis hic est qui me capillo hinc de curru deripit? 870
 imperium tuum demutat atque edictum Apollinis.

{Men.} But who is this who tears me from the chariot by my hair?
 He changes your order and the edict of Apollo.

The text suggests a bravura physical performance as the charging actor suddenly hurls himself backward, his hair caught by an invisible hand.³⁵ The old man flees in terror to fetch the doctor, leaving Menaechmus II in possession of the stage.

Plautus allows himself a brilliant little encore of this mad scene. The father-in-law, returning with the doctor, finds instead his real son-in-law, Menaechmus I, who is of course perplexed, then outraged to be diagnosed as mad. The doctor's questions goad him to an outburst sufficiently intemperate to offer proof of madness (he accuses his father-in-law of temple robbery and parricide!, 941–945). Doctor and father-in-law leave and return with some burly slaves to subdue their “patient.” Messenio, the servant of Menaechmus II arrives just in time to rescue the man he takes to be his master from this assault, and thus begins the final unraveling of the twins' identities.

While the *Amphitruo* offers a more obviously paratragic meditation on the power of the gods to rob men of their identities in pursuit of their own gratifications, the *Menaechmi* and in particular Menaechmus II's brilliantly improvised mad scene shows how the power of tragic madness can be harnessed for human purposes,³⁶ far more successfully than in the *Mercator*.

35 The more learned in the audience might be reminded how Athena catches Achilles by the hair before he can attack Agamemnon in *Iliad* 1. 197: ξανθῆς δὲ κόμης ἔλε Πηλείωνα. Sharrock (2009: 53–54) sees a looser parody of this in line 1 of the *Epidicus* when Epidicus grabs Thesprio by the cloak (*pallio*).

36 Though the thesis of Stärk (1989) that the whole of the *Menaechmi* is an independent Plautine creation has not won widespread acceptance, this empowering use of madness seems particularly Plautine and fundamental to the play's eucatastrophe.

More broadly, we can see that Plautus's metatheatrical deployment of the *armarium* of tragic techniques, from linguistic style to type scenes, only rarely settles for using tragedy as a momentary comic foil. Instead, Plautus frequently hijacks the power and growing cultural prestige of tragedy for his own ends. Tragedy in the hands of the clever slave might be a study in itself. What the slave girl Pardalisca in *Casina* achieves in serving the women's plot, or the young men of *Mercator* and *Menaechmi* for their own ends, can rival the whole tragic genre in the person of a practiced *servus callidus*. Chrysalus in the *Bacchides* proclaims his final victory over the *senex* in his play in a monologue (925–978) that blends mythic tragedy (the fall of Troy) with contemporary Roman triumph.³⁷

Plautus was certainly not alone among the writers of Roman comedy in mining the resources of tragedy (the discussion in Evanthius 3.5 noted above (285) links him specifically with Afranius in this), though fragments cannot show if any others approached his daring. Terence's approach is profoundly different, and his occasional snapshots of tragedy serve primarily to ironize his comic characters.

Terence explicitly rejects any sort of "madness" as appropriate for comedy in his ongoing dispute with his "old poet" rival, Luscius Lanuvinus. In the prologue to the *Phormio* he summarizes a recent attack by Lanuvinus (4–8):

qui ita dictitat, quas ante hic fecit fabulas
 tenui esse oratione et scriptura levi: 5
 quia nusquam insanum scripsit adolescentulum
 cervam videre fugere et sectari canes
 et eam plorare, orare ut subveniat sibi.

who keeps saying that [our poet] wrote his previous plays
 with flimsy dialogue and light-weight style:
 because he never created a mad youngster
 who hallucinated a fleeing hind, pursued by hounds,
 and a hind moreover weeping, begging him to come to her aid.

The reasonable inference is that Lanuvinus had recently premiered a play featuring such a hallucinating adolescent, perhaps with a particular mythological prototype.³⁸ Terence will have none of this.

37 Cf. Slater (1985: 110–13); cf. earlier Sedgwick (1927) Segal (1968: 129–31), and Jocelyn (1969).

38 Cf. Sharrock (2009: 81–83).

Perhaps one example of Terence's more ironic eye for tragedy will suffice. In the *Eunuch* young Chaerea, overcome by the sight of an enslaved girl he has seen in the street, has disguised himself as a eunuch to follow her into the women's quarters—and there raped her. In his post-assault soliloquy, he seems to try to justify his actions by citing the “inspiration” of a painting of Jupiter and Danaë he sees in the room, recalling the moment of decision this way (*Eunuchus* 590–591):

at quem deum! “qui templa caeli summa sonitu concutit.”
ego homuncio hoc non facerem? ego illud vero ita feci—ac lubens.

But what a god! “who shakes the highest halls of heaven with thunder.”
Was I, a mere mortal, not to do the same? Truly I did it just so—and gladly.

The second part of line 590 certainly sounds tragic, indeed particularly Ennian, as Donatus suggests though no ancient source attributes it to a tragedy.³⁹ Sharrock very intriguingly sees the figure of Pentheus in the *Bacchae* behind Chaerea's violent invasion of the women's world here.⁴⁰ The tragic quotation, if quotation it be, however, serves not to heroize Chaerea but to ironize both his own and Jupiter's actions: neither looks good as a rapist. The Terentian lens focuses on the microscopic moment, rather than the Plautine panorama.

It may be that a panoramic and distanced view of tragedy was a lasting legacy of the Plautine perspective. Ingo Gildenhard has recently drawn attention to the apparent emotional distance between spectator and tragic spectacle in the late Republic, at least as exemplified by Cicero in an intriguing passage of the *De officiis* (1.97):

sed tum servare illud poetas, quod deceat, dicimus, cum id, quod quaque
persona dignum est, et fit et dicitur; ut, si Aeacus aut Minos diceret:

oderint, dum metuant,

39 Donatus attributes *sonitu concutit* to Ennius, without telling us which work, and says that *templa caeli* is said *tragice*, although the closest parallels to that locution are in *Annales* fragments, such as *in caerula caeli templa* (v. 54). Jocelyn (1969: 137) suspects an allusion to Naevius's *Danaë* also. The possibility exists that Terence is here trying his hand at faking the tragic style, but a genuine quotation seems more likely.

40 Sharrock (2009: 221–26); cf. also Sharrock (2013: 55–57).

aut:

natis sepulchre ipse est parens,

indecorum videretur, quod eos fuisse iustos accepimus; at Atreo dicente
 plausus excitantur; est enim digna persona oratio.

Now, we say that the poets observe propriety, when every word or action
 is in accord with each individual character. For example, if Aeacus or
 Minos said:

“Let them hate, if only they fear,”

or:

“The father is himself his children’s tomb,”

that would seem improper, because we are told that they were just men.
 But when Atreus speaks those lines, they call forth applause; for the senti-
 ment is in keeping with the character. (trans. Miller)

Roman tragedy (a performance of Accius’s *Atreus* is the occasion for Cicero’s discussion) is thus viewed at a distance, the quality of its performance judged by the rhetorical excellence of its character painting. One might argue that such aesthetic distance is just an elite perspective, save for the fact that Cicero appeals to the applause in the theatre (*plausus excitantur*) as the measure of success: they applaud the performance, not the sentiment expressed. Gildenhard argues that “the degree of existential identification and emotional bonding between the dramatic protagonists and the spectators must have been low” and suggests that the world of tragedy was seen “as a realm of, above all, fiction, rhetoric, and spectacle.”⁴¹

While mythological tragedy was a Greek import from its very beginnings at Rome, it is by no means clear that it seemed so distant from the beginning. Anecdotes about the emotional power of Greek tragedy in performance abound,⁴² and it would seem curious for the Romans to borrow it without

41 Gildenhard (2010: 167).

42 From women miscarrying in the theatre at the shock of the appearance of Aeschylus’s *Furies* (*Life of Aeschylus* 9) to the actor Polus in the title role of a revival of Sophocles’

some interest in that emotional affect. The Roman comic theatre as it survives to us was in theory just as distant, its characters and settings fictionally Greek, but emotionally a much more recognizable Plautinopolis,⁴³ where the fates of the young lovers and clever slaves are of interest to the spectators, not just the *ethopoia* of their speeches. As they shared the stage for a few more centuries, it seems at least worth asking whether the critical eye of comedy, particularly as controlled by Plautus, contributed to increasing the aesthetic difference between the two, framing tragedy as the world of *celsitudo* and *tumor*.

Electra, carrying the urn with the bones of his own deceased son within it on stage (Aulus Gellius 6. 5. 7–8).

43 For this term, cf. Gratwick (1982: 112–13).

PART 4

Seneca after Antiquity



Schlegel, Shelley and the “Death” of Seneca

Helen Slaney

Seneca, let blood line by line and page by page, at length must needs die to our stage.

GREENE (1589) preface to *Menaphon*

• • •

The post-classical declamatory mode . . . which animates Senecan tragedy . . . is the form, too, which at notorious moments in the history of European scholarship and taste killed it.

A.J. BOYLE (1997: 113)

• • •

Reports of my death have been greatly exaggerated.

MARK TWAIN

Over Seneca's pre-eminence as a resource for early modern dramatists, there is now little dispute.¹ Similarly, twentieth-century theatre-makers working under the influence of Artaud have rediscovered the potential of Senecan drama as a vehicle for confronting catastrophe on a more-than-human scale. It is generally assumed, however, that between these periods Seneca was indeed dead to our stage, or at any rate dormant. This ostensible death did not result from misadventure, but from a series of deliberate character assassinations beginning with the remarks of philhellenist theorist August Wilhelm Schlegel in his 1808 series of *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*, remarks which taken in isolation seem to function as an epitaph for Senecan dramaturgy. But at the same time as Schlegel was driving a critical stake through the Senecan corpus, its features and form were elsewhere being revived: in Heinrich von Kleist's iconoclastic verse drama *Penthesilea* (of which an extract was first performed in 1811), and a few years later in Percy Bysshe Shelley's gothic revenge tragedy *The Cenci* (1818). Neither play lays explicit claim to a Senecan antecedent, but both possess stylistic, thematic, and aesthetic attributes which place them in

¹ Norland (2011); Boyle (1997); Miola (1992).

what could be regarded as the Senecan tradition, but could equally be interpreted as a sub-genre of tragedy: the hypertragic (*Hypertragödie*).² Ingrained in this expressive and excessive theatrical mode, certain indispensable elements derived from Seneca had become too diffused to eradicate.³

1 A Backdrop to Schlegel

Schlegel's *Vorlesungen über Dramatische Kunst und Literatur* established an orthodox model which continues to exercise considerable influence over the appreciation of tragedy.⁴ His Sophocles is the epitome of a classical perfection that developed from Aeschylus' primal grandeur and deteriorated into Euripides' "flattery of the gross external senses" (*Lecture* 8). Modern poets, however, should not attempt to imitate Greek purity, but instead draw inspiration from the romance and pageantry of (German) history, with Shakespeare as their immediate model (*Lecture* 30).⁵ In between his idolization of Greece and his canonization of modern playwrights, Schlegel finds himself forced to mention Roman tragedy, a regrettable episode in theatrical history which he represents in singularly abusive terms. Although preferring to ascribe the Senecan corpus to the decadence of late antiquity, Schlegel concedes that its style is congruent with a Neronian Rome corrupted by luxury and tyranny. Furthermore,

whatever period may have given birth to the tragedies of Seneca, they are beyond description bombastic and frigid, unnatural both in character and action, revolting from their violation of propriety, and so destitute of theatrical effect, that I believe they were never meant to leave the rhetorical schools for the stage. With the old tragedies, those sublime creations of the poetical genius of the Greeks, they have nothing in common but the name, the outward form, and the mythological materials; and yet

2 *Hypertragödie* is the term applied to *Penthesilea* by Hermand (1995).

3 Senecan theatre is thus rhizomorphic, as defined by Deleuze & Guattari (2004: 10): "A rhizome may be broken, shattered at a given spot, but it will start up again on one of its old lines, or on new lines . . . [It] can rebound time and time again after most of it has been destroyed." Hardwick (2011: 39–44) applies the rhizomorphic model to classical reception.

4 Butler (1935: 310); Beus (2003: 42). Translated into English by Black in 1815; circulated on the Continent initially through Mme de Staël and her intellectually influential associates. For Schlegel's influence on English critics such as Hazlitt, cf. Bate (1989: 147).

5 Beus (2003: 11–42, esp. 16, 38).

they seem to have been composed with the obvious purpose of surpassing them; in which attempt they succeed as much as a hollow hyperbole would in competition with a most fervent truth. Every tragical commonplace is worried out to the last gasp; all is phrase; even the most common remark is forced and stilted . . . Their characters are neither ideal nor real beings, but misshapen gigantic puppets, who are set in motion at one time by the string of an unnatural heroism, and at another by that of a passion equally unnatural, which no guilt nor enormity can appal.

. . . In a history, therefore, of Dramatic Art, I should altogether have passed over the tragedies of Seneca, if, from a blind prejudice for everything which has come down to us from antiquity, had they not been often imitated in modern times. (*Lecture 15*).⁶

This shows the vehemence of Schlegel's distaste as well as the precise terms in which the Senecan aesthetic is rejected. Above all, Senecan characters and their behaviour are "unnatural" (*ohne Natur*), a quality here applied pejoratively, implying a default dramatic norm which reproduces Nature; that is, which imitates exterior appearances. Disproportionately inflated and "bombastic" (*schwülstig*)—a criticism often directed at drama conveyed in speech acts rather than mimetic action—Seneca's verbal overload is likewise interpreted not as an affective asset but as an untheatrical encumbrance. The unacceptable hyperbole of rhetorical discourse is exacerbated by the characters' lack of autonomy and moral integrity. They exercise no free will, and therefore cannot be tragic; they exercise no restraint, and therefore cannot, according to Schlegel's idealist definition, be heroic. Schlegel identifies in this passage all the distinctive elements of Senecan poetics, but ironically turns these same elements into derogatory ammunition. Seneca fills the role of foil to Greek sublimity: the villainous double, the fallen antitype. His works resemble Greek tragedy sufficiently to invite comparison, sharing the name and form and features, but Schlegel recoils from such resemblance, explaining it as invidious mimicry. The Greeks were the original, holy source, which Seneca has profaned. Attempting to surpass these masterworks, his typically Roman hubris has produced not art but monstrosity. Every narrative needs a villain, and Schlegel's is Seneca: a counterweight to Greek pre-eminence, an uncanny shadow cast by the gallery of marble profiles which he cannot afford to pass over in silence (too often "imitated in modern times"). Instead, Schlegel attempts to repress this recurring force with a diatribe as violent as the material he seeks to expel

6 Schlegel (1846 [1815]: 210–211; trans. Black).

from the repertoire. Seneca, compelled underground, persists in the very passion of Schlegel's rhetoric.

Schlegel's ideas owed much to the philhellenist movement based at the Weimar court under Goethe and Schiller, the father-figures of German classicism.⁷ Philhellenism embraced an idealised Ancient Greece for its purity and serenity, embodied in sculpture such as the Belvedere Apollo and the Laocoön group, which ironically date from the Roman period themselves. Nevertheless, according to art historian Johann Joachim Winckelmann in his brief essay *On the imitation of the painting and sculpture of the Greeks* (1755), such works displayed "a noble simplicity and sedate grandeur in gesture and expression" which was "also the true characteristic mark of the best and maturest Greek writings," by which he meant Sophocles. The nationalist dimension to German philhellenism imagined a special relationship between a culturally superior democratic Athens and the ideals to which the Weimar intelligentsia aspired.⁸ In pursuit of Grecian *Schönheit* (beauty), according to Friedrich Schiller, humanity would reform itself morally and politically. Schiller appropriated Greece as "the well-spring of all beauty, untainted by the corruption of generations or of ages, which wallow in the dark eddies beneath it." (*Aesthetische Briefe* 9).⁹ Rome, for Schiller, is the original source of this corruption. Seneca's plays, then, came to stand for the absolute antithesis of what Germany required from antiquity: their darkness and corruption provided a powerful foil to perfected Schillerian *Schönheit*.

This division of *die Antike* into pristine Greece and decadent Rome was a relatively recent phenomenon.¹⁰ In 1754, playwright and critic Gotthold Lessing had embarked on a commentary *Von den Lateinischen Trauerspielen welche unter dem Namen des Seneca bekannt sind*. Although treating only two plays, *Hercules Furens* and *Thyestes*, Lessing provides a valuable insight into Seneca's reception just prior to the philhellenic surge. It is a balanced and overall complimentary assessment of the plays' strengths, such as their poetic beauty (*Schönheit*), their compelling momentum, and their inevitable flaws,

7 Reed (1980); Butler (1935); Beus (2003). Richter (2005: 450–51) points out that no distinction can be adequately drawn between Germany's "Classical" and "Romantic" movements: "Not only are the Jena romantics and idealist philosophers . . . just a few kilometers down the road, but Goethe and Schiller's "classical" efforts are perfectly consistent with and even exemplary of the broader and far more legitimate phenomenon of European romanticism." Cf. also Grair (2005: 63.) For more on A.W. Schlegel's literary theory generally, cf. Ewton (1972) and Reavis (1978).

8 Stray (1998: 15, 25); Butler (1935); Bernal (1987: 193).

9 Trans. Snell (1994: 51–52).

10 For a succinct account, cf. Barner (1973: 90).

namely lapses in unity of time and a penchant for overstatement: "He is all too prodigal with poetic colour, too bold in his descriptions . . . All too often, he gives Nature the appearance of Art";¹¹ but these, insists Lessing, are *lauter Fehler, in die ein schlechtes Genie niemals fallen wird* ("honourable faults, into which a lesser genius would never have fallen"). Along with translating or paraphrasing substantial portions of the text, Lessing envisages the plays in virtual production throughout.¹² *Hercules Furens*, he suggests, would lend itself particularly well to the machinery, choreography and evocative soundscapes of opera. Certain scenes, such as the "splendid display" (*prächtigen Aussicht*) of Thyestes banqueting within the palace, are singled out for their exemplary stagecraft, while others require modification: Hercules, for example, should fall mad onstage but then commit his murders out of sight, to be related by Amphytrion after the fact.

Far from denying performance, Lessing accepts it as Seneca's natural medium, integral to a full understanding of the works. At the same time, he also regards the plays' accommodation to modern contexts as inseparable from their appreciation as art. Crébillon may have gone too far in having "watered down" (*gewässert*) his *Atrée et Thyeste* almost beyond recognition, but Lessing himself is not averse to the odd dramaturgical tweak in the interests of verisimilitude, advising would-be modern adaptors where to undertake such revisions as choral exits, line divisions, moral focus and additional characters. Some passages are altogether too poetic for their speakers, such as Atreus' hunting-dog simile (*Thyestes* 497–503), which despite being *in dem Munde des Dichters . . . sehr schön* becomes *recherché* and unnatural *in dem Munde der Person selbst*. Lessing admires Seneca's feeling for language, but admits that it rings uneasily in a modern ear less accustomed to rhetorical flourishes (*Blümchen*) than the magniloquent Romans. His solution, however, is not to condemn the ancient playwright but rather to promote his work via practical concessions to the evolution of theatrical taste. Lessing applied some of his recommendations for the modern adaptation of Seneca to his *bürgerliche Trauerspiel, Miss Sara Sampson* (1755),¹³ wherein a self-confessed *neue Medea* threatens her unfaithful lover with the murder of their daughter: *Ich will mit begieriger Hand Glied von Glied, Ader von Ader, Nerve von Nerve lösen und das*

11 *Er ist mit den poetischen Farben allzuverschwanderish gewesen; er ist oft in seiner Zeichnung zu kühn . . . die Natur scheint bei ihm allzuviel von der Kunst zu haben.* Translations from TS are my own.

12 Barner (1973: 24–30) shows how Lessing's background as *Theaterpraktiker* contributed to his interpretations; cf. also Riedel (1996: 84–86).

13 Barner (1973: 36–51).

Kleinste derselben auch da noch nicht aufhören zu schneiden und zu brennen (2.7).¹⁴ This type of expressionism did not last, however, but was progressively squeezed out of German theatre by the pincer movement of stage naturalism and *Gräkomanie* (philhellenism).¹⁵

Following Winckelmann's irreversible introduction of philhellenism into German intellectual culture, Lessing revised his position on classical aesthetics accordingly, making no minor contribution to the emerging discourse.¹⁶ His 1766 essay "Laocoön" defends the inarticulate suffering of Sophoclean hero Philoctetes in relation to Seneca's characters, *Klopfechter in Cothurne*, "prizefighters in platform boots", who elicit no sympathy with their diatribes. "Laocoön" debates whether theatre should be regarded as a primarily aural medium (like poetry) or primarily visual (like painting), and this vacillation between aural and visual affect springs from an on-going wrestle with the form and function of dramatic language. In practice, pictorial verisimilitude was winning out over verbal dexterity, whether in the form of a bourgeois (*bürgerliche*) realism that replicated the subtlety of everyday actions, or a Romantic realism that plunged actors into genuine frenzy during performance.¹⁷ Both styles supplanted an older theatre of the word with a modern theatre of action, and dramatic poetry gradually became unstageable.

Schlegel's theoretical position, then, was defined within a theatrical marketplace averse to rhetorical presentation, prioritising identification with a character over immersion in their language. No longer restricted to channeling poetic imagery, actors and their visible interactions had assumed semiotic value in their own right. This is apparent in Goethe's version of *Iphigenia in Tauris* (first produced as prose in 1779; revised into verse in 1802). Expunging the less desirable qualities of Euripides' protagonist—her cruelty, her duplicity—"Goethe created in *Iphigenie* what Winckelmann had seen in

14 I will with exultant hand sever limb from limb, vein from vein, nerve from nerve, and not cease to cut and to burn even the smallest part.

15 Richter (2005: 242).

16 Riedel (1996: 83–98).

17 Patterson (1990); Williams (1985); Marshall (1988); Brown (2004). According to Richter (2005: 68), Lessing wrote the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* in 1767–1768 as part of "the latest, unsuccessful attempt to give the nonexistent nation a nonexistent theatre"; it contains much criticism of French dramatists, especially Voltaire, and is responding to what Williams (1985: 13) calls "the grandiose gestures and vainglorious poses" of the current pseudo-French school of acting. The most comprehensive contemporary account of the debate is Diderot's *Paradoxe sur le comédien* (1769).

Laocoön: noble simplicity and serene greatness."¹⁸ Goethe's *Iphigenie* represents an optimistic experiment in recapturing classical form, *das Land der Griechen mit der Seele suchend* (*Iphigenie* 1.1.12).¹⁹

Following the professionalization of the Weimar troupe, Goethe directed Schlegel's own translation of Euripides' romantic tragedy *Ion*. *Ion*'s staging deliberately reproduced contemporary impressions of classical antiquity, presenting spectators with a panoramic view of mountainsides "bathed in morning light that tinted with red the peak of Parnassus in the distance."²⁰ Actors appeared as statuesque silhouettes in the doorway of a columned temple. The careful attention exercised over the visual details of the piece marked a turning point in Goethe's directorial practice. Like his contemporaries, Goethe came to regard theatre as a series of images, rather than an immersive or environmental experience. Whereas Lessing found it hard to decide which category this hybrid art form belonged to, Goethe as a director had no such doubts. "The stage should be regarded as an empty picture," he wrote in his *Rules for Actors* (1803), "for which the actors supply the figures."²¹ Goethe assumed an unusual degree of control over what today would be termed blocking, the positioning of actors in relation to one another in order to elucidate the meaning of the text, and over the *mise-en-scène*, the coherence of interpretation. Previously, actors had been accustomed to attend to their own personal delivery, but not its integration into the piece as a whole.²² Now it was realised that meaningful configurations need not be limited to dramatic tableaux, but could extend throughout the whole play. Along with the proscenium stage, the recent introduction of footlights also contributed to the visual orientation of stagecraft. Footlights, as Patterson points out, "provide a barrier between actor and audience, and effectively prevent the performer from seeing the audience, thus

18 Butler (1935: 101). Zimmermann (2004: 142) argues that Goethe "humanized the theology of Greek tragedy" and ennobled his characters to bring out what he saw as the *aufklärische Duktus der euripideischen Tragödien* (137).

19 Iphigenie may be contrasted in this respect with Helena in *Faust*, personification of a vanished Greek ideal which moderns can only admire, never truly possess.; Butler (1935: 144); Grair (2005: 86).

20 Carlson (1978: 165).

21 Trans. Carlson (1978: 309–18). This idea of the stage-picture as a totality was initiated in London by Garrick's collaborator, designer Louthembourg; cf. Baugh (2007: 47–49).

22 Patterson (1990: 19). Powell (1984: 101) likewise demonstrates that early eighteenth-century blocking often depended on the relative precedence of the actors, and that "The emphasis is strongly on the words themselves and the particular attitude of the character speaking them" rather than creating a stage-picture.

creating the “‘dark hole’ of the auditorium, *so approved of by Stanislavsky*”.²³ Instead of clamouring for the attention of a raucous crowd, assailing their consciousness with the psychoactive penetration of sound and demanding in return that they participate in sustaining a dynamic relationship, performers sealed themselves off in a self-contained “peep-show” and relied on emotional identification to dissolve the fourth wall.²⁴

Despite their attempt to transcend artistic limitations with a revolution of the tragic spirit, the Weimar troupe could not seal the rift between a professional theatre catering to the public taste for sentimental romances and bourgeois comedy—with dialogue in everyday prose—and the new genre of closet drama, dramatic poetry composed without the intention of staging.²⁵ Goethe regarded his own *Faust* as an artwork which should not be diminished by accommodating it to the practicalities of production.²⁶ Schlegel condemned Seneca not only because of his association with Roman decadence, but also because current theatrical practice had squeezed Senecan poetics out of the picture. Theatre, especially classical theatre, had become a space for viewing statues, not hearing them scream.

2 “Colossal, Misshapen Marionettes”

Just after Schlegel published his strongly-worded opposition to all things Senecan, controversial playwright Heinrich von Kleist composed his *Penthesilea*, a *Hypertragödie* which attacked the foundations of philhellenic classicism. While Schlegel was denouncing Seneca’s *riesenhafte unförmlich Marionetten* (colossal, misshapen marionettes), Kleist was countering the fetish for classical sculpture with a different kind of emulation in his dialogue *Über das Marionettentheater* (1810). Marionettes, he explains, “incapable of affectation” (*sie sich niemals zierte*), perform purified motion. They are suspended from a single wire, a single centre of gravity around which their limbs move without conscious intervention, making the line traced by the passage of this centre through space “nothing other than the path of the dancer’s soul” (*nicht*

23 Patterson (1990: 31). Emphasis added.

24 On the invention of the fourth wall, cf. Marshall (1988: 105). “Peep-show” is Patterson’s term (1990: 31).

25 Bourgeois drama is discussed by Brown (2004) and Williams (1985: 113–19); on closet drama, cf. Beus (2003: 43–69).

26 Patterson (1990: 115).

anders, als der Weg der Seele des Tänzers).²⁷ Human beings, earthbound and wretchedly self-conscious, cannot aspire to this pure line, this weightlessness that comes with the total absence of free will. Innocence—grace—cannot be restored, but it can be purchased. In terming Seneca's characters *riesenhafte unförmlich Marionetten*, Schlegel was recognising and recoiling from the same quality of dehumanisation which Kleist places next to godliness.

Penthesilea, a violent subversion of its Greek mythic subject matter in which the Amazon queen falls desperately in love with Achilles and finally murders him in erotic fury, draws upon Seneca's *Phaedra*. Achilles, like Hippolytus, stands for the perfectly-proportioned ideal of masculine beauty, pursued by a powerful queen driven mad by an inner conflict between desire and duty. Erika Fischer-Lichte describes the postmodern restaging of classical drama as a *sparagmos*, a Dionysiac dismemberment / resurrection of text,²⁸ and Kleist commits his version of *sparagmos* with a literal gusto evident in few other adaptations. Possessed by her erotic madness, Kleist's *Penthesilea* hunts down and devours a surrendering Achilles. In a twist on the myth of Actaeon, she believes him to be a stag; in a twist on the *Bacchae*, she must eventually regain her senses and confront his mutilated corpse; like *Phaedra*, she acknowledges responsibility for destroying the youth's incomparable beauty, and commits suicide. The deed is "monstrous" (*entsetzlich*, 2714; *scheußlich*, 2895), and she herself is a "monster" (*scheußlich*, 2617; *Ungeheuerste*, 3000), transgressing not only the Amazons' religious and social customs but the boundaries of classical mythology.

Kleist's reworking of ancient sources could in fact be regarded as no more radical than Goethe's own *Iphigenia in Tauris*, but *Penthesilea* tears open the ancient wounds which *Iphigenia* had so diplomatically healed. Both plays pivot on invisible rites dedicated to the goddess Artemis/Diana, but whereas *Iphigenia* transmutes human sacrifice into reconciliation, *Penthesilea* supplants lovemaking (the euphemistic "Festival of Roses") with a terminal consummation of her passion. She calls her unspeakable act a "slip of the tongue" (*Ich habe . . . bloß versprochen*, 2986). *Penthesilea*'s mouth repeatedly confuses kissing and rending in this scene, as she sarcastically asks her attendant priestesses, *Küßt ich ihn tot? . . . Nicht? Küßt ich nicht? Zerissen wirklich?* ("Did I kiss him to death? . . . No? Did I not kiss him? Or rather savage him?", 2978), leading to the natural culmination of the conflation of violence and eroticism committed throughout the play: *Küsse, Bisse / Das reimt sich, und war recht von*

27 Kleist (1993a: 340); cf. also *Marionettentheater* (trans. Wilford 1989).

28 Fischer-Lichte (1999: 17).

Herzen liebt, / Kann schon das eine für das andre greifen (2981–2983).²⁹ Kissing, eating and speaking are interchangeable, in Kleist's grotesque economy of orality. Deprived of her knife and arrows, Penthesilea then uses speech alone to sharpen the edge of her remorse and plunge it repeatedly into her own breast, like verbal iron; absurdly, outrageously, horribly, she talks herself to death. Goethe was not surprisingly unreceptive to Kleist's aesthetic.³⁰ Written in the Senecan mode, Kleist's experiment uses the arc of a Phaedra-plot to disrupt classicism from within, turning on its "alabaster" (2928) heroes, dragging them down from their pedestals into a dark bacchanal.

Although not staged in full for several decades, an extract from *Penthesilea* was first performed as tragic pantomime in the Roman manner. In April, 1811, at the Berlin Schauspielhaus, professional mime artist Henriette Hendel-Schütz performed Scene 23 of the work while her husband, an antiquarian and professor of philosophy at Halle, recited the text alongside.³¹ Hendel-Schütz had already become internationally renowned for the classically-themed *tableaux vivants* which she began developing in 1795 after seeing Rehberg's sketches of Emma, Lady Hamilton's Grecian *Attitudes*.³² Hamilton likewise created these sequences of poses in collaboration with her husband, who drew on his first-hand knowledge of literary sources and material culture to fashion an art-form based on reconstructing ancient pantomime.³³ Attempts had been made throughout the eighteenth century to revive ancient pantomime in the form of *ballet d'action*,³⁴ Professor Schütz maintaining in his own work on the subject that "the origin of the ballet is to be sought in the pantomime of the Romans."³⁵

The performance art practised by Lady Hamilton and professionalized by Hendel-Schütz was inspired by the elevation of sculpture to the epitome of "the Classical". Schlegel, in imaginatively reconstructing ancient stagecraft, had promulgated an apparently self-evident definition of tragedy as animated

29 A kiss, a bite—how cheek by jowl / they are, and when you love straight from the heart / the greedy mouth so easily mistakes / one for the other (trans. Greenberg).

30 Gutjahr (2006); Reeve (1993). According to Mommsen (1974: 41), it is possible to interpret "the relationship of Penthesilea to Achilles fundamentally as a symbol of Kleist's inner attitude towards Goethe" (*das Verhältnis Penthesileas zu Achill grundsätzlich als Gleichnis von Kleists innerer Einstellung zu Goethe*): a cocktail of envy, ambition, hate, as well as love and hero-worship, focused less on Goethe as an individual than on the type of classicism he represented.

31 Reeve (1993: 79).

32 Homlström (1967: 184–86).

33 Touchette (2000: 123–46).

34 Lada-Richards (2003) and (2010).

35 Holmström (1967: 259 n.108).

sculpture.³⁶ Hamilton's *Attitudes* and Hendel-Schütz's *tableaux vivants* participated in the same conflation of art-forms. Part solo ballet, part living statue, they presented a series of figures from antiquity—usually tragic—in characteristic poses, assisted by the drapery of a shawl or scarf. Not only the precision of the poses but the grace of the transitions appealed to the spectators.³⁷ Although it could be argued that these women's bodies were reduced to mannequins crafted and displayed by their respective male partners,³⁸ manipulative artistry played no part in the rhetoric of the *Attitudes*. Indeed, the puppet could be seen as the antithesis of the free-standing groundedness of classical sculpture.

Hendel-Schütz's *Penthesilea* seems something of an anomaly. Unlike the coy Caryatids which comprised her usual program,³⁹ Kleist's Scene 23 depicts a frenzied Amazon and a Homeric warrior locked in a fight to the death. Moreover, unlike the silent portrait-gallery which classical *Attitudes* typically sought to recreate, this performance was accompanied by a particular text. The scene consists almost entirely of a messenger-speech, the climactic monologue which relates how Penthesilea sets her dogs on Achilles, and in response to his gasps for mercy, "sinks her teeth into his white breast, dogs / and woman struggling to outdo each other" (*Den Zahn schlägt sie in seine weiße Brust, / Sie und die Hunde, die wetteifernden*, 2670–2671). The narrative offers opportunities for embodying the roles of both hunter and prey, as it switches back and forth between the perspective of dying, pleading Achilles and that of the raging Amazon. Where Kleist keeps the bloodshed offstage, Hendel-Schütz's enactment brings it back before the audience. Although nothing of the kind had been suggested at this time as a performance medium for Senecan tragedy in antiquity, it is intriguing that Hendel-Schütz chose to realise Kleist's most Senecan work as pantomime. Her fusion of dramatic poetry with pantomime

36 "It is only before the groups of Niobe or Laocoon that we first enter the spirit of the tragedies of Sophocles," and the tragic spirit "may be most clearly recognised in Sculpture, where the perfection of form is merely a symbol of mental perfection and the loftiest moral ideas" (*Lecture XI*, 148). More explicitly, "The most accurate conception [of ancient actors] . . . is to imagine them as so many statues in the grand style endowed with life and motion." (*Lecture IV*, 62).

37 Touchette (2000: 139–40).

38 Marshall (1998) comments on the Pygmalion-like qualities of the Hamiltons' collaboration. On the use of sculpture as a basis for classical drama into the nineteenth century, cf. Macintosh (2013: 520–23) and also Lada-Richards (2003: 21–33).

39 Holmström (1967: 191–200).

action replicated a medium which has been recently associated with the performance of Seneca in first-century Rome.⁴⁰

3 The Cenci

When Shelley composed his gothic revenge-tragedy *The Cenci* in 1818, it followed many of the conventions established by gothic melodrama, a theatrical genre which flourished between 1790 and 1820.⁴¹ Set in motion by their villains, gothic plots took place in dark, oppressive settings, typically involving supernatural encounters and the revelation of secret horrors. As well as the novels of authors like Ann Radcliffe and Matthew Lewis, the plays' source material included Jacobean and Restoration tragedies, which supplied dramatic precedent for the ghosts, the bloodthirstiness, the hyperbole and the cruelty.⁴² They also shared the objective of arousing visceral responses, basing their effects upon suspense and sensation. Terror, rather than pity, was the appropriate response to both the uncanny setting and the multiple shocks delivered by the gothic plot. *The Cenci* also displays recognisably Senecan characteristics. Shelley's combination of violence and rhetoric, the Count's unspoken and unspeakable crime, his egregious depravity and his daughter's implacable revenge are conducted in accordance with a universe providing no alternative to abjection, and may all be traced via the revenge dramas of Shakespeare's contemporaries back to the theatrical manipulation of horror that emanates from Seneca.

The Cenci has been plagued by denials of the text's performative dimension and shelved in the distinctively Romantic genre of lyric drama. Nevertheless, it should be distinguished from other works comprising the Romantic genre of lyrical or "closet" drama in that it was written primarily for the stage, not for private reading. Although releasing it as a published text after its rejection by Covent Garden, Shelley specifies *The Cenci's* intended conditions of performance in a letter to his business agent:

40 Zanobi (2014), expanding on the findings of Zanobi (2008) and Zimmermann (2008).

41 Curran (1970: 159–73); also Murphy (1975: 152–84, and 13–22) on Shelley's engagement with gothic themes more broadly. Ranger (1991: 107) gives 1757 as the date for the earliest proto-gothic drama; Cox (2002: 125–26) identifies Walpole's *The Mysterious Mother* (1768) as the first stage example of full-blown gothic, but concludes that most works fitting this description were produced "roughly between 1789 and 1832" Its concurrence with the French Revolution is not coincidental.

42 Cox (2002: 125) also mentions its debt to the German *Sturm-und-Drang* school.

What I want you to do is to procure for me its presentation at Covent Garden. The principal character, Beatrice, is precisely fitted for Miss O'Neill... (God forbid that I should see her play it—it would tear my nerves to pieces); and in all respects it is fitted only for Covent Garden. The chief male character I confess I should be very unwilling that anyone but [Edmund] Kean should play.⁴³

He adds in a subsequent letter that the play was "expressly written for theatrical exhibition" and he believed it "singularly fitted for the stage."⁴⁴ Shelley professes to seek a public and embodied medium for his text. To this end, he employed an unusually accessible style of writing, incorporated popular gothic conventions, and selected star actors for the leading roles.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, he placed them in an unacceptable vehicle, revolving around the (unspoken, unspeakable) act of incestuous rape, an idea which the *London Magazine* condemned as "abhorrent to the feelings of the general standard."⁴⁶ It is possible that Shelley merely miscalculated the extent of general abhorrence for his subject; it is equally possible that by advertising the play's dramatic potential along with its suppression, he was staging a practical protest about censorship. As Michael Simpson points out, drawing attention to the fact that something is hidden from view—kept, as it were, "in the closet"—functions as a rhetorical strategy emphasising the act of concealment, the injunction to silence.⁴⁷

It is not only a conscious application of tropes on Shelley's part which makes *The Cenci* a Senecan play, although Mary Shelley observed in her journal that he was "read[ing] Seneca every day & all day."⁴⁸ Direct references in the text in fact remain few, but affinities can be established with *Thyestes*, *Medea* and *Phaedra* as well as with *Oedipus*, which Shelley attributes solely to Sophocles in his Preface, although he may well have also been familiar with the Dryden/Lee version then experiencing similar impediments to its exhibition on the English

43 Letter 23 to Thomas Peacock dated July 1819, in Brett-Smith (1909: 194).

44 Quoted in Strand and Zimmermann (1996: 261).

45 Curran (1970: 169–171) comments on how these choices tapped into the performers' celebrity.

46 White (1966: 188). The most scathing review was that in *The Literary Gazette*, which called the play "an abomination" and "a dish of carrion, seasoned with sulphur". It is interesting how many of the reviews echo Beatrice's reluctance to give a name to Cenci's crime; cf. White (1966: 167–215).

47 Simpson (1998: 310–13); cf. also comment by Worton (1982: 108) on the play's opening line, "The matter of the murder is hushed up".

48 May 10, 1815. "Seneca's Tragedies" were among Shelley's recorded reading for 1815; cf. Feldman and Scott-Kilvert (1987: 92).

stage.⁴⁹ These affinities can be divided into thematic congruities, specific passages, and a more general concern with the communicative or affective capacity of spoken language. In addition, the unacknowledged debt of *The Cenci* to *Titus Andronicus* suggests a further, if oblique, link to Senecan poetics.

Elaborate verbal descriptions of physical pain feature among *The Cenci*'s Senecan attributes. These include Beatrice's accounts of her father's habitual abuse (2.1.64–71 and 3.1.44–48) and the Count's curse on his daughter, with its kaleidoscopic images of bodily corruption (4.1.128–136),⁵⁰ and extend into the judicial chamber of the final act. The efficacy of torture is debated extensively, but finally the Judge declares, "I'll wring the truth / Out of these nerves and sinews, groan by groan" (5.2.193–194). That "truth" resides in the body is borne out by Beatrice's experience of pain she cannot communicate; the Judge's error is to suppose that the voice which he orders to issue from a tortured body bears integrity, that he can extract coherent speech from inarticulate agony. He similarly elides the objective of torture with its outcome in piously commanding, "Let tortures strain the truth 'til it be white / As snow thrice sifted by the frozen wind" (4.2.169–170). It is not, in fact, "truth" that the rack will strain, but the nerves and sinews of the victim, and no metaphorical snow that will whiten with sifting and freezing, but rather the victim's lips ("yet white from the rack's kiss", 4.2.8). The Judge's attempt to distance himself from all but the spiritual dimension of torture is capped and grimly undercut by Cardinal Camillo's response as he returns this imaginary driven snow "yet stained with blood" (4.2.171).

Beatrice and her father both appear as super-powerful, even to the extent of erasing distinctions between themselves and the surrounding world. Plotting to assault Beatrice, the Count gloats that his act will resound through Hell, while "upon Earth / All good shall droop and sicken, and ill things / Shall with a spirit of unnatural life / Stir and be quickened . . . even as I am now" (4.1.183–89). Such responsiveness of natural phenomena to the qualities of a protagonist occurs most obviously in Seneca's *Oedipus*, *Phaedra*, *Thyestes* and *Medea*. Count Cenci's evil displays a libertine streak not found in Seneca's characters, but owing more to the maniacal villains of Marston and Middleton, as well as *Titus Andronicus*' Aaron. What Cenci does inherit from Atreus is an inability to satisfy his appetite, an impulse towards excess that drives him almost against

49 On links between the Dryden/Lee *Oedipus* and *The Cenci*, cf. Macintosh (2009: 116–18) and Hall and Macintosh (2005: 6 and 530–31).

50 Cantor (1976: 95) notes the similarities between this passage and *King Lear*. On Cenci's perception of "a causal, almost mystical relationship between words and events", cf. Worton (1982: 112–13).

his will to commit crimes of greater and greater obscenity in an effort to stimulate his overstimulated flesh (1.1.98–103).⁵¹

Like her father, Beatrice feels the need to surpass what has gone before, convinced that her injury can only be wiped out by an act of greater violence: "something which shall make / The thing that I have suffered but a shadow / In the dread lightning which avenges it" (3.1.87–89). Far from the typically swooning heroines of gothic melodrama, Shelley's Beatrice wields considerable power of her own; although her eloquence fails to persuade, her gaze and "tones" (5.2.108) have the ability to reduce the men who oppose her to speechlessness and confusion. "My brain is swimming round," (1.3.164) admits Cenci, after Beatrice's Act 1 appeal to justice: "Inarticulate words / Fell from my lips" (2.1.113–114). Similarly, the hired assassin Marzio begs her to turn away eyes that "wound worse than torture" (5.2.109), protesting like Cenci that his "brain swims round" (5.2.91) under the intensity of her regard. Beatrice coerces professional killers to murder the Count on her behalf, and proclaims when the body is discovered that "The deed is done, / And what may follow now regards not me. / I am as universal as the light; / Free as the earth-surrounding air; as firm / As the world's centre" (4.4.45–50). Her power makes her untouchable, a state which she expresses by claiming affinity with elemental absolutes: at once identified with the earth's core, the infinite air and most tellingly with the "universal" light, she momentarily attains a stature that unites her with Seneca's avatar of globalised revenge, Medea.

A natural world operating in diabolical concert with human actions becomes standard in gothic fiction and melodrama, and shows its presence in earlier revenge tragedy often enough to be satirised ("Is there no thunder left? . . . Oh, there it goes!").⁵² This responsiveness is traditionally concentrated in the *locus horridus*, the verbal scenery of a crime, a place whose characteristics metonymically represent the corrupted world containing the play's action. Seneca's *Thyestes* (650–682) and *Oedipus* (530–547) are both examples, as is Tamora's setting for her imagined death in *Titus Andronicus* (2.3.91–108), which subsequently becomes the site of Lavinia's rape. *The Cenci* also contains a *locus horridus*, namely the scene of the Count's proposed assassination. Beatrice describes with Romantic sensibility how the overhang clings to the crag like a dying soul to life, while beneath it, "huge in despair, as if in weariness, / The melancholy mountain yawns" (3.1.256–57). This, apart from the formal

51 The *locus classicus* for this is Atreus: *bene est, abunde est, iam sat est, etiam mihi. / sed cur satis est? pergam et implebo patrem / funere suorum.* (*Thyestes* 889–891).

52 Middleton, *The Revenger's Tragedy* 4.2.196–197.

structure of ecphrasis detailing a hostile landscape, is not especially Senecan; however, Beatrice then adds (3.1.260–265):

High above there grow,
 With intersecting trunks, from crag to crag,
 Cedars, and yews, and pines; whose tangled hair
 Is matted in one solid roof of shade
 By the dark ivy's twine. At noonday here
 'Tis twilight, and at sunset blackest night.

The specific trees, especially yew, the tangled branches, and the darkness at midday all occur in both *Oedipus* and *Thyestes*.

Two further passages suggest a Senecan flavour. Having announced his sons' death, Cenci raises a golden bowl of "bright wine whose purple splendour leaps and bubbles gaily," proposing that if it were their "mingled blood" he would drink it with even greater pleasure; this image inverts the goblet of filial blood mistaken for wine in the *Thyestes* (913–918). Later in the scene Cenci returns to the goblet, entreating the wine to stiffen his resolve "as if thou wert indeed my children's blood / which I did thirst to drink!" (1.3.175–176). At the other end of the play, as Beatrice prepares to face execution, she reconciles herself to dying with an image of maternal consolation: "Come, obscure Death, / And wind me in thine all-embracing arms! / Like a fond mother hide me in thy bosom," (5.4.115–117). Her sentiments resemble Phaedra's, who likewise addresses a Death to whom she runs for comfort and envelopment (1188–1190):

O Mors amoris una sedamen mali
O Mors pudoris maximum laesi decus,
confugimus ad te: pande placatos sinus.

O death, the only remedy for evil love,
 O death, the most appropriate end for injured chastity,
 I'm running to you; open your peaceful embrace.

Beatrice herself is no Phaedra, but the associations of damaged honour, sexual injury, perjury in the interests of purity, and unspeakable horrors silenced are audible through Shelley's play, and surface in Beatrice's farewell to a rotted world.

A major theme of the Cenci is finding adequate language to express something beyond expression—a *nescioquid*, a *nefas*—while simultaneously drawing attention to its exclusion from direct discourse. Constant ellipses stand in

for explicit references to the Count's intention or the deed itself (e.g., 1.1.102, 1.2.37, 2.1.56, 3.1.50, 3.1.56). Beatrice describes her recollection of the event as "like a ghost shrouded and folded up / In its own formless horror" (3.1.110–111); her misery, even if ever shared by another victim, has never been recounted verbally and must "die without a name" (3.1.118). "There are deeds / which have no form," she explains, "sufferings which have no tongue" (3.1.141–142). According to Beatrice, Cenci's crime is wordless, "expressionless" (3.1.214). Others find euphemisms such as "ravage" (3.1.372) and "outrage" (3.1.348), but for Beatrice herself, as for the entire verbal scheme of the play, no adequate term exists to convey the extent of the damage wrought on her body and her mind by incestuous rape.

The Cenci is predicated precisely on the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of expressing linguistically the 'formless horror' of physical trauma.⁵³ As elsewhere in the Senecan tradition, the inability of Shelley's characters to translate pain into words with literal acuity results in a compensatory overflow of figurative discourse, an excess of hyperbolic language that translates it instead into metaphors that implant a reconstituted version of that pain in the consciousness of the audience.⁵⁴ Shelley preserves the traumatic event as an open secret in a dense closet of imagery impossible to visualise. Beatrice, having just been raped, enters in a state of apparent delusion which denies the audience the visual logic of a narrative, obliging them instead to suffer a disconnected string of powerful sensory blows (3.1.9–22):

The pavement sinks under my feet! The walls
Spin round! I see a woman weeping there,
And standing calm and motionless, whilst I
Slide giddily as the world reels . . . My God!
The beautiful blue heaven is flecked with blood!
The sunshine on the floor is black! The air
Is changed to vapours such as the dead breathe

53 Cf. Worton (1982: esp. 107–109).

54 As Endo (1996: 383) argues *en route* to a definition of the Shelleyan Sublime, metaphor permits language to remain concrete—opaque, and therefore "world-disclosive"—in a way that everyday speech is not. Worton (1982: 114) similarly identifies in *The Cenci* "two kinds of verbal expression: (1) the act of speaking in order to communicate and (2) the act of self-expression, which falls inevitably into silence as language proves incapable of formulating thought." Peterfreund (1991) shows how the latter (metaphor) is perverted into the former (metonymy) as Beatrice adopts the casuistic language of her oppressors in the courtroom.

In charnel pits! Pah! I am choked! There creeps
 A changing, black, contaminating mist
 About me . . . Tis substantial, heavy, thick,
 I cannot pluck it from me, for it glues
 My fingers and my limbs to one another,
 And eats into my sinews, and dissolves
 My flesh to a pollution.

Her inability to name Cenci's crime results not in catatonia but in logorrhoea. As William Jewett argues, Beatrice's speech becomes "expressive rather than communicative" as the discourses inherited from the reigning patriarchy founder on the mute fact of her violated body. "Unfolding in a purely private register . . . [her language] impedes rather than facilitates understanding."⁵⁵ Jewett identifies her "rich, if circumlocutory" speech as a kind of *praeteritio*, professing to conceal a secret whose presence is advertised by this same elaborate speech-act of occlusion.⁵⁶

This implies a suggestive link with *Titus Andronicus*. That Shelley drew on a number of Shakespeare's more respectable tragedies, including *Macbeth*, *King Lear* and *Hamlet*, has been well established,⁵⁷ but *Titus Andronicus* does not seem to have rated a mention among Shelley's Shakespearean resources. Like *Titus Andronicus*, *The Cenci* is a revenge tragedy divided into two halves. The rape and effective silencing of a virgin daughter is followed by an account of retribution that compromises the revenger's moral superiority. Both plays centre on a father-daughter relationship in which love turns toxic; it should be recalled that Titus himself stages Lavinia's death as entertainment at his cannibalistic banquet (5.3.46–49). In addition to the reminiscences already mentioned (such as Aaron's depravity and Tamora's *locus horridus*), the scene with most evident resemblance to *Titus Andronicus* is Beatrice's entry after the rape. Just as Marcus translates the horror of Lavinia's injuries into excessively poetic ecphrasis (*Titus Andronicus* 2.4.11–57), so Shelley's Beatrice translates the horror of her own experience into a stream of unsubstantiated images. She attempts to dissociate herself verbally from the body which has suffered, and claims to have been silenced by these "sufferings which have no tongue" (3.1.142). Severed from the sphere of interpersonal communication in which mimetic drama operates, Beatrice Cenci takes refuge in Senecan discourse,

55 Jewett (1996: 330).

56 Jewett (1996: 323); compare Simpson (1998) on "closeting".

57 Cantor (1976: 91–108).

a theatrical device that pitches its auditors into an otherwise unrepresentable excess of sensation.

4 Conclusion

During the eighteenth century, Senecan drama was under pressure from two powerful forces: on the one hand, it failed to comply with the philhellenic construction of what antiquity had to offer, and on the other it failed to comply with the prevailing theatrical preference for visual interest, genteel morals and sentimental plots. The groundwork was laid for academic dismissal of Seneca as a serious dramatist. Nevertheless, it cannot be said that his style and form no longer exerted an attraction for playwrights. As shown by plays like *The Cenci* and *Penthesilea*, the appetite for hypertragedy remained even when Seneca's presence could no longer be acknowledged. Schlegel may have victoriously drowned Senecan theatre in vitriol, but even such influential reports of Seneca's death could not prevent the ongoing development of his afterlife.⁵⁸

58 The ideas in this contribution are extracted from a section of my doctoral thesis, which is currently in press as part of OUP's Classical Presences series under the title *The Senecan Aesthetic: a performance history*.

Seneca Tragicus in the Twentieth Century: Hugo Claus' Adaptations of *Thyestes*, *Oedipus* and *Phaedra*

Betine van Zyl Smit

In the twentieth century the tragedies of Seneca once again came into vigorous life thanks to the renowned Flemish poet, playwright and novelist, Hugo Claus. Claus was the most prolific adaptor of Senecan tragedy for the modern stage. His versions¹ of Seneca's *Thyestes* (1966), *Oedipus* (1971) and *Phaedra* (1980) seized the attention and imagination of theatregoers in Belgium and the Netherlands and have all been staged numerous times. They have also been published. These adaptations represent significant and provocative interpretations of the ancient plays. This chapter investigates Claus' engagement with Seneca's texts, the ways in which he adapted them, performances of Claus' new plays and their reception by critics and scholars.

It is remarkable that Claus' adaptations of Senecan tragedies have found little resonance in the Anglophone world. They have not been published in English translation and have not been widely performed in English, although they have been translated into French and performed in France and Germany. Thus it is not surprising that there has been little scholarly work in English on these adaptations. Davis devotes less than two pages² in his chapter on the reception of Seneca's *Thyestes* to Claus' version. Meyer's discussion, in his book on Seneca's *Phaedra*, of Claus' adaptation is even briefer.³

Fortunately there have been some Flemish and Dutch scholars who have published studies of Claus' reinterpretation of Seneca's work. De Decker situates Claus' *Thyestes* in his wider theatrical oeuvre in his study *Over Claus' toneel* (*About Claus' plays*),⁴ which was published in 1971 and thus preceded the other plays derived from Senecan tragedy. Van der Paardt provides enlightening analysis and commentary on Claus' reworking of the Classics in various studies. His *Als twee minnaars* (*Like two lovers*), was written as an introductory lecture for a season of performances of *Thyestes* by Het Zuidelijk Toneel

1 Hugo Claus includes "naar Seneca", "after Seneca", in the titles of each of these three plays, thus making their derivation from the Roman tragedian explicit.

2 Davis (2003: 130–32).

3 Meyer (2002: 84–85).

4 De Decker (1971: 123–35).

in 1991/2, while the concluding chapter of his *Antieke motieven in de moderne Nederlandse letterkunde* dealt with Claus' *Phaedra*. Claus' noteworthy engagement with the Oedipus myth and Seneca's interpretation of it have been investigated by Claes in *Claus' Oedipodie*, as well as by Decreus in *Van Oedipus naar Blindeman, van Seneca naar Claus*. Van der Paardt has also produced a short overview of the reception of Seneca's texts in Claus' *Thyestes*, *Oedipus* and *Phaedra* in *Wolken van Kwaad: Over Seneca en Hugo Claus (Clouds of Evil: About Seneca and Hugo Claus)*. The most thorough analysis of Claus' use of ancient literature is Claes' volume, *De mot zit in de mythe: Hugo Claus en de oudheid (Moths have got into myth: Hugo Claus and antiquity)*. Claes' study embraces all Claus' work: poetry, novels and plays, and discusses the classical allusions, references, translations, and adaptations. It is indispensable for any scholar wishing to explore this aspect of Claus' work. "Claus classicus", a chapter in Claes' *Claus-reading* (1984), contains a summary of the more extensive book. It is a useful introduction to Claus' relationship with antiquity and contains detailed discussions of his treatments of the tragedies of Seneca. It clearly emerges from the scholarly work that the attraction of the Roman tragedies for Claus lay not in their perfection, but in their flawed nature. He saw a link between what he called their "cheap shock tactics, with excessive horror and grand-guignol"⁵ and the sensationalist reporting of murder and accidents in modern newspapers.

It was precisely these characteristics of Seneca's tragedies that had resulted in their low regard, even amongst scholars, in the first half of the twentieth century. So much so that even one of the French translators, Maurice Mignon, seemed convinced that only a handful of academics were still interested in the plays.⁶ Mignon, seems not to have been aware that there were already some influential figures presenting arguments for a reappraisal of Seneca's tragedies. The two who are most pertinent to Claus' preoccupation with Seneca were T.S. Eliot and Antonin Artaud.⁷ Artaud's references to Seneca, and specifically to his *Thyestes*, date from the period when Mignon was translating the Latin tragedies. Eliot's influential essay, *Seneca in Elizabethan Translation*, written as introduction for the 1927 republication of Thomas Newton's collection of

5 Cited by Paul Claes (1984: 268). All translations from Flemish and Latin are my own.

6 Maurice Mignon (1961: 1, tr.): En dehors des étudiants, des professeurs et d'une poignée de spécialistes, qui donc lit aujourd'hui les tragédies de Sénèque? Et qui oserait plaider pour Sénèque le Tragique?

7 Van der Paardt (1982: 78–79) notes that Claus was attracted to Senecan tragedy because of Artaud's admiration of Seneca and because of Eliot's defence of Seneca's predilection for bombastic rhetoric and his gruesome scenes and descriptions.

Elizabethan translations (1581), was known to Claus and further spurred his interest in Seneca's tragedies.⁸ Claus admired the Elizabethan playwrights, and their references to Seneca and echoes of his rhetorical style added to his own interest in Seneca's plays. Claus admits that he was stimulated by his decadent style, his mannerism, his sensationalism and all that was sinister and inharmonious.⁹

One of the main driving forces for Claus' first reworking of Senecan tragedy was his admiration for the literary theory and practice of Artaud. Perhaps the most substantial evidence of Artaud's influence on the creative work of Claus is his adaptation and staging of Seneca's *Thyestes* in 1966. Artaud had singled out this tragedy as representing the epitome of his concept of the theatre of cruelty¹⁰ and, although he had probably not developed a complete script for stage performance, he may have tried to mount a play derived from Seneca's tragedy in Marseille.¹¹ Claus' creation of his *Thyestes* may have started as an attempt to bring Artaud's design to fruition and was thus on one level an act of homage to the Frenchman¹² whom he regarded as a literary father. He saw himself as heir to Artaud's intellectual and artistic ideas. The young Flemish poet's perception of this affinity was a powerful influence in his writing.¹³ A further inspiration for Claus was Vittorio Gassman's production of Seneca's *Thyestes* in Rome in 1953.¹⁴ Artaud's singling out of Seneca's *Thyestes* as the quintessential example of the theatre of cruelty had also influenced Gassman. It was only in 1966 that Claus brought his version of this tragedy to the stage. It is clear that Claus was particularly interested in the surrealistic elements¹⁵

8 De Decker (1971: 111).

9 Claes (1984: 85).

10 Artaud (1961: vol. 3, 303–304).

11 Esslin (1976: 37) mentions Artaud's project for staging *Thyestes*. The few fragments of Artaud's adaptation that survive are included in Artaud (1961: vol. 2, 189–91). This volume also gives some details of Artaud's conception of the play, 185–188. Its title was to be *Le Supplice de Tantale* (*The Punishment of Tantalus*). He envisaged staging it outside normal theatrical venues, in a space in a factory or exhibition hall to give it contemporary urgency.

12 Claus indicated to Claes that his *Thyestes* was a nostalgic attempt to recapture the performance he thought Artaud would have staged; cf. Claes (1984: 85).

13 Van der Paardt (1982: 79) cites Wildemeersch's conclusion that for Claus, Artaud was an inverted father figure and that by honouring him, Claus was symbolically killing his own father.

14 Davis (2003: 28–30) describes this adaptation.

15 Cf. Wildemeersch (2009: 54) for a discussion of Claus' interest in surrealism. Wildemeersch writes that already in his first play, *Een bruid in de morgen* (*A Bride in the morning*) in 1955, Claus had already indicated that he was not interested in realistic drama.

in Senecan tragedy. In *Thyestes* the introduction of otherworldly figures like the Fury and Tantalus and the reversal of the order of nature provided great scope for this predilection. Claus even extended some of these elements. His version of *Oedipus* elaborates the necromancy of Laius which in the Latin play is described in the words of Creon. Claus brings the spirit of Laius on stage, and his direct speech and forceful commands¹⁶ to Oedipus are much more powerful than the report of their appearance in the original.

An overview of the text and performance of *Thyestes*, *Oedipus* and *Phaedra* will illustrate the way in which Claus adapted Seneca's tragedy for the modern stage. The published text of each of the plays contains copious stage directions that enable readers to understand Claus' ideas about the tragedies and how they should be staged. The ancient plays have no separate stage directions, but the action is to be interpreted from the text. This is not the place to discuss the question of whether Seneca wrote his tragedies for stage performance. Hugo Claus saw them as texts that could be turned into works for the stage and he did so with remarkable success.

1 *Thyestes*

Claus also directed the first production of his *Thyestes* in Brussels in 1966. It was only the second time that he took on this role and he made imaginative use of the opportunity to create a "Gesamtkunstwerk" in which every aspect of the performance, movement, music, décor, diction and acting corresponded to his vision. This conception of "total theatre" probably stems at least partly from the ideas expressed by Artaud in his manifesto for the theatre of cruelty.¹⁷ Other ideas that correspond to Artaud's theory of theatre are the importance of the ensemble or totality of the conception ("spectacle total"),¹⁸ words delivered in incantatory style,¹⁹ unusual musical instruments,²⁰ and objects of unusual size such as the huge throne in *Thyestes*. It is clear from the many reviews of

16 Hugo Claus (1975: 55–57).

17 Cf. Odette Virmaux (1975: 18): suppression de la dualité auteur-metteur en scène et notion de créateur unique.

18 Virmaux (1975: 17).

19 Virmaux (1975: 18).

20 Virmaux (1975: 19); see the review of R. De Neef in *Gazet van Antwerpen*, 3 May 1966. He notes that the music and sound produced by Louis De Meester built a suggestive aural décor that evoked a background of war.

the production, as well as from interviews with Claus and from his programme notes, that his conception was of a drama far removed from the realistic plays mostly on offer at the time, and also performed in a way very different from the conventional staging of a straightforward translation of a classical drama.²¹ Claus' adaptation transformed the text and also the texture of the play. His *Thyestes* is set in an undefined period, timeless and yet applicable to all times. Many reviewers note the ritualistic elements in the performance. Claus' notes for the first performance explicitly correlate the unspeakable violence of the Thyestes myth, Atreus' vengeful butchering of his brother's children and tricking Thyestes into the most horrifying act of unwitting cannibalism, with the sensationalism of contemporary newspapers. "The tragic, black hero, the rhetorical communication, the sensationalism, the blood and bloody affairs, and all this, like a newspaper, interspersed with a narrow, moralising tone, what has more resemblance to the newspapers of today?"²² asked Claus.

Van der Paardt²³ reminds us that Claus did not work from Seneca's Latin texts only, but based his versions on French, German and English translations. Claes confirms that Claus made use of modern translations and stresses that his aims were aesthetic and not didactic.²⁴ In his study, Claes analyses how Claus used the French translation of Mignon and the English translation of Miller for his version of *Thyestes*.²⁵ Claus follows the general structure of the original, but omits parts of the text, especially long passages that would detract from the mounting tension. Claus mentions that unlike Corneille, who omitted "ce qui peut soulever le coeur des dames", he cut out pseudo-geography, self-justifying ethical morsels and anthropomorphic raptures over star signs.²⁶ By trimming the decorative descriptions, especially in the choral odes, Claus keeps the focus more intensely on the struggle at the heart of the play with all its evil and horror. For a modern audience Claus' succinct lines can have more impact than the elaborate, baroque descriptions of the Latin. For instance, there is the highly wrought epic simile of Seneca's chorus in *Thyestes* 573–595, celebrating the peace and tranquillity experienced in a city when armed conflict has been ended. Only the last line is retained in a striking translation: er

21 Wildemeersch (2009: 51–53) discusses Claus' approach in his plays as avoiding realism. Seneca's *Thyestes* itself could be described as surrealist and Claus' adaptation shows an affinity for preserving and enlarging the surrealist trend.

22 My translation of note 6 of Claus' fifteen notes in the programme of the production.

23 Van der Paardt (1982: 81).

24 Claes (1984: 65–66).

25 Claes (1984: 272–75).

26 De Decker (1971: 126).

is vrede in de stad. Als een zee. Je kan de vissen zien (There is peace in the city. Like a sea. You can see the fish.).²⁷ Thus Claus has captured the essence of the original by selecting a line *et vacat mersos numerare pisces* (593), without the classical allusions that proliferate in the previous lines, and rendering it in direct language.

De Decker also discusses the difference in style between the dialogues of the two playwrights. While Seneca introduces Atreus by giving him a monologue expressed in complex, carefully structured syntax (176–204), Claus' Atreus utters broken phrases: *Laf bin ik. Als een kind. Ik wil niet en ik kan niet* (Silly I am. Like a child. I do not want and I cannot.).²⁸ This fragmented dialogue anticipates the way in which Ted Hughes renders the complex syntax of the Latin in his adaptation of Seneca's *Oedipus*.²⁹ Hughes breaks even more decisively with conventional syntax and punctuation, but it is striking that both poets chose disintegration as the modern equivalent of the sophisticated sentence structure of ancient poetic syntax. Claes has convincingly shown³⁰ that Claus made use of Hughes' version of Seneca's *Oedipus*. However, it is clear that he had already, before Hughes, developed this mode of utterance for Senecan protagonists. Interestingly, Claus' Oedipus in his adaptation speaks quite coherently, while the chorus of the play sometimes deliver more disjointed lines, but that is partly the result of their utterances being distributed amongst the different members of Claus' chorus in his *Oedipus*.

Another technique deployed by Claus to create variety is the breaking up of long monologues and allotting lines to different characters, for instance, Atreus' account of the symbolic value of the golden fleece, (225–234), which is part of a longer speech, is recited by the young servant in a rather sing-song fashion to highlight its didactic aspect.³¹ The confirmation by another of Atreus' reasons for bearing a grudge against his brother strengthens his case, while the servant's mask of the ram highlights the symbol of royal power at the centre of the fraternal struggle. De Decker³² notes that Claus adds suspense to the plot by avoiding mention of the details of Atreus' vengeance at an early

27 Claus (1966: 44).

28 Claus (1966: 18).

29 Ted Hughes (1969: 13) has Oedipus start his first monologue in this way: And I was happy escaping from my father Polybus freedom not exile wandering unafraid a prince fleeing yes but unafraid.

30 Claes (1984: 282–87).

31 Claus (1966: 22–23).

32 De Decker (1971: 129).

stage. Thus while Seneca's Atreus calls on Procne³³ for inspiration (275–276) and then specifies the way in which Thyestes will devour his sons, (277–278), Claus at this point only has him smile, showing that he has found a plan that satisfies him, and say that it is enough and pleases him. The reticence of Atreus thus creates tension and fear of the unknown evil he is planning.

Further emphasis on the theme of royal power comes from the setting of Claus' play. Unlike the ancient play which follows the convention of an out of doors scene, Claus has chosen the main hall of the palace where a gigantic throne dominates the bare space.³⁴ It is surmounted by a ram's head, immediately lending prominence to the family dispute over control of the fabled ram with the Golden Fleece.³⁵

Claus represents the spirit of Tantalus as a repulsive, bloated old man who is disoriented to find himself in his ancestral house and rehearses its evil past in the prologue while fearing that even worse is to come from his monstrous descendants. Claes³⁶ notes that Claus had both Tantalus and Thyestes limping to indicate the family curse linking them.³⁷ The Fury is a seductive young woman who taunts Tantalus with terrifying visions of the foul crimes his sons will commit. His attempts to resist spreading the family curse and to prevent further crimes are futile. Claus presents the Fury forcing Tantalus to touch the mute figures of Atreus and Thyestes and the children who have appeared on the stage in the prologue. This physical demonstration of the contagion of the family curse prefigures the hatred, violence, and blood to come.

The integration of the chorus into modern adaptations and productions of classical plays provides a challenge to playwrights. Claus handles the chorus in a different way in each of his treatments of Senecan tragedy. In *Thyestes* he indicates that the chorus is to be one man with no distinguishing features who speaks without much intonation. He is dressed in contemporary clothes, thus marking him out from the actors in ancient dress and identifying him as a representative of the modern world. He addresses the audience directly. Seneca's

33 Procne in Greek mythology killed her son Itys and served him in a stew to her husband Tereus as revenge for his rape and mutilation of her sister Philomela.

34 Claus explained that he had made the throne so high so that no one could take a seat on it in a dignified manner. You have to take an inelegant jump to reach the seat. This design can be interpreted as a judgment on the striving for royal power central to the play. There is no natural and orderly way of obtaining the kingship of Mycenae.

35 Possession of the pelt of the golden ram gave the right to the kingship.

36 Claes (1984) 507.

37 Claes (1984: 506) notes that this handicap, at its most visible in Oedipus, encapsulates Claus' fascination with the Oedipus myth and is even given to characters in his modern plays, such as *Mama, kijk zonder handen!* (*Look Mother, no hands!*)

tragic choruses are written in complex lyric metres and abound in allusions to myth and often obscure geographical features that emphasise the reach of the Roman Empire. In keeping with Claus' transformation of the character of the chorus, his words have been simplified. His first utterance is framed by an appeal that, if there is any god who loves humankind, he should speak. Of course this appeal remains unanswered. The immediacy of this fruitless appeal is enhanced by the simplicity of the words. Where Seneca's invocation of the ancient gods is delivered in lines rich with geographical names and details of the history of the mythological family of the Tantalids, Claus omits the names, but keeps the bare facts of the family's gruesome history. It is generalised to represent the cycle of human evil overwhelming the world (17):

Waarom blijft het menselijk beest groeien
als een rattenkoning, wijder en wreedaardiger dan ooit tevoren,
aaneengeklit in het kwaad zonder schaamte?

Why does the human beast keep growing,
like a rat king, broader and crueller than ever before,
linked into evil, without shame?

The absence of a reply to the chorus' call to a god, if there is any, to respond, starkly emphasises the absence of gods and creates an atmosphere of existential bleakness. This chimes with Seneca's depiction of a world without gods in *Thyestes* where Atreus brings about the disruption of the natural world by his evil actions and where he sees himself as a god to whom he sacrifices his brother's children. Jasper Heywood, the Elizabethan translator of *Thyestes*, was not satisfied with the abrupt ending³⁸ of Seneca's tragedy. Thyestes is helpless in the face of Atreus' monstrous gloating and taunts. Atreus insists that his brother's distress is due to his not having been able to serve Atreus' children to him because he thought they too might be his own children (1104–1110):

Atreus: scio quod queraris, scelere praerepto doles,
nec quod nefandas hauseris angit dapes,
quod non pararis. fuerat hic animus tibi
instruere similes inscio fratri cibos
et adiuvante matre aggredi

38 Cf. Boyle (1983: 222): The play in fact does not end; it stops. It stops at the precise moment of the beast's satisfaction. And to Thyestes' deluded prayer (1110–11 with 1112.) the beast's retort is predictive. Punishment awaits the victim, not the satisfied beast.

similique leto sternere. hoc unum obstitit:
tuos putasti.

Atreus: I know why you are complaining, you are distressed that I anticipated your crime.
You are not suffering because you have eaten the unspeakable meal, but because you did not prepare it. Your plan was to prepare such food for your unsuspecting brother and, with the help of their mother, to attack and kill his children in the same way. There was one obstacle: You thought they were yours.³⁹

These harsh and unrepentant words cause the defenceless Thyestes to cry out despairingly: The gods of vengeance will come; my prayers give you over to them for punishment (*Vindices aderunt dei; his puniendum vota te tradunt mea*, 1110–1111). The ineffectuality of the gods has been shown in the play. Atreus himself has become a perverted god and retorts gloatingly: I give you over to your children for punishment (*Te puniendum liberis trado tuis*, 1112).

As a cleric shaped by Christian culture⁴⁰ and with his own conception of tragedy, Heywood must have thought such unpunished depravity unsuitable for the ending of the elevated genre of tragedy. He added a prayer of his own composition in which Thyestes calls upon the gods to punish him for the monstrous wickedness of eating his own children. The confession of impiety on the part of one of the brothers must have seemed to Heywood to bring some resolution to the succession of crimes.

This is in sharp contrast to the ending of *Thyestes* added by Claus: Zo was het. En het zal niet anders zijn. Nutteloos wentelt het geweldige wiel door de tijd... (translated below, 70). The despairing conclusion is reminiscent of the end of *Het huis van Labdakos* where the Laius character utters a similar sentiment about the unceasing cycle of internecine human struggles (287).⁴¹ The emphasis on the never-ending cycle of evil is enhanced by Claus' direction that

39 My translation.

40 Cf. J. Kerrigan (1996: 111–12) for Christian influences in Heywood's translations of Senecan tragedy.

41 Cf. also the ending of *De dans van de reiger*, (*The dance of the heron*), another of Claus' plays.

the Tantalus figure should reappear as Atreus speaks his last words. Tantalus seated on the double throne is thus the visual representation of the words added by Claus as a choral ending which brought no resolution to the cycle of evil, but spread the contagion of guilt for unspeakable crimes on a global scale:

So it was: it will not be different in future
 It is futile that the giant wheel circles through time,
 Think of the families who tear each other apart, of burnt palaces,
 Kingdoms which disappear like dew. Think of the gods, still silent,
 Still fleeing, of nations being tortured and slaughtered like sheep.
 Nature is constantly despoiled.
 Blood mingles in evil and in lust, more swiftly in lust,
 And the questions remain unchanged
 For worms as for humans.
 And still night does not cover the earth with her deadly, thick clouds.

In his programme notes for the production Claus wrote that the apocalyptic end of *Thyestes*, the return to chaos, did not seem so remote today. The play script reflects the sombre atmosphere of the 1960s at the height of the Cold War, when many expected a nuclear catastrophe, but the apocalyptic ending also has a timeless quality, applicable to the ever present, inherent evil in human-kind in our relation to fellow humans and the earth. It is by such alterations of and additions to Seneca's text that Claus underlines his aesthetic transformation of the ancient play and perfects his relocation to the modern world where there are no gods and where human beings inflict harm on one another with impunity. Claus' stage directions (69) that the two brothers remain embraced at the end, "like two lovers", highlight the bond of evil that unites them.

2 Oedipus

The sombre spirit of the fear of nuclear war also pervades Claus' *Oedipus*. Oedipus does not speak the opening words, but the desolation and havoc wrought by the plague indicated in the first five lines are given to the chorus (as in Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*) in an extended dialogue scene. The English poet Ted Hughes, in his 1969 adaptation of Seneca's *Oedipus* already assigned Oedipus' first lines to his chorus. Although Claes has indicated⁴² that Claus made extensive use of Hughes' adaptation for his version, Claus' conception of

42 Claes (1984: 281–92).

the chorus and its role in the play as a whole is his own, and is an integral part of his radical reinterpretation. Claes convincingly points out that although Claus drew to a remarkable extent from the *Oedipus* of Ted Hughes, and also from the English translation of Watling, the use of these intertexts was mostly confined to his poetic formulation of the dialogue, while the overall framework, structure and interpretation are Claus' own invention.

Claus' stage directions and the words of his chorus sketch a post-apocalyptic, scorched world. The plague of the ancient world is described in terms that would fit the destruction caused by a nuclear attack. Like Seneca's *Oedipus*, Claus' protagonist feels responsible for the devastation caused in his kingdom. His belief is that only God will be able to provide salvation. Claus' radical alteration of the role of the chorus makes it the protagonist of the drama. Members of the chorus also play the roles of the shepherd, the old man Phorbas, Manto, the young daughter and assistant of Tiresias, a slave, Laius, and two women. Although the outline of the action is kept, a number of scenes that are described in the speeches of the ancient play are acted out in the new version. The live representation is instigated by members of the chorus and results in vivid plays within the play. The most fundamental change that becomes apparent in the re-enactment is that Claus has made the chorus, the community, responsible for Laius' murder. Because they seek to transfer their guilt to Oedipus, the play gains a new psychological dimension.

In the scene of sacrifice where Tiresias is attempting divination, Oedipus and Jocasta play the sacrificial victims by the chorus placing on their heads masks of the heads of a bull and a heifer. Their participation thus already links them to the unnatural signs described by Manto and implicates them in perverted acts. In a further mime which replaces the description of Tiresias' necromancy and of the summoning of Laius in Creon's words in Seneca's tragedy (530–658), the ghost of Laius directly accuses Oedipus of being his murderer and also of having an incestuous relationship with Jocasta. He rouses the Thebans to expel Oedipus (57):

Mensen van Thebe, jaag uw koning weg,
verjaag dit monster van uw land. Nu. Snel.
Verbrand het gras
waarover zijn vervloekte voeten liepen
en het zal weer groen worden.

People of Thebes, drive your king away,
expel this monster from your land. Now. Quickly.

Burn the grass on which his cursed feet have walked
and it will become green again.

Oedipus is shown as perplexed by the accusation. The chorus accuse him, but in their re-enactment of the scene of Laius' murder, they are again shown to be the killers. The audience are thus aware that this Oedipus is innocent and sympathy is generated for his suffering. He has become a victim of a plot by others to shift their guilt onto him. Their tactic is so successful that Oedipus himself begins to suspect that he is guilty. The plot follows the pattern of the ancient plays of Seneca and Sophocles: the message of the death of king Polybus inexorably leads to Oedipus discovering his true identity. He makes no attempt to evade the guilt for the murder and incest and punishes himself by tearing out his eyes. Seneca's graphic description is taken over by Claus, but, unlike the awestruck account of the ancient messenger (915–979), this chorus is almost gleeful in its telling of the horrific deed. The hostility of the chorus is shown up by the tender love for Oedipus that Jocasta reveals, for instance when she mentions his "dearest, strong fingers".⁴³ Claus adopted Ted Hughes's innovation that Jocasta hates Laius because he had taken her firstborn from her. But Claus elaborates this aspect of Jocasta's character and has her acknowledge at the end that, when Oedipus arrived in Thebes, she recognised him by his crippled feet (95). The blame for the incest is therefore hers, as she knowingly married her own son. Oedipus is thus innocent of both crime and sin, but, nevertheless, he has taken on the guilt and inflicted a merciless punishment on himself. The despairing end of Seneca's drama is intensified by the harsh lack of compassion of Claus' chorus. Claus gives to the chorus the Senecan line *siste, ne in matrem incidas* (1051) where Oedipus cautions himself not to fall over Jocasta's body and which has been criticized⁴⁴ as rather tasteless and melodramatic in its intensification of the gruesome details of the play's resolution with the onstage suicide of Jocasta. They tauntingly exhort him: *Val niet over het lijk van je moeder!* (Don't fall over your mother's corpse! 99), thus demonstrating their utter lack of sympathy with his plight. He is under the illusion that he will be taking the pest with him, but, as he leaves, the stage directions have the chorus first dance, and then fall into the same comatose state as at the start of the play. It seems that Oedipus' suffering and sacrifice have been in vain. Claus' recasting of Seneca's drama places human fate and the human condition under human control and

43 "liefste, sterke vingers" (96).

44 Tarrant (1985) in his note to *Thyestes* 1046–1047 refers to this line, *Oed.* 1051, as tasteless, but Boyle (2011: 358) regards it as "powerfully and deeply tragic".

leaves us with a pessimistic conclusion about humankind's inherent evil and lack of love for their fellow human beings.

In his second dramatic version of the Oedipus story, *Het huis van Labdakos*, Claus made use of elements not only in Seneca's *Oedipus*, but also in Sophocles' two Oedipus plays as well as his *Antigone* and Euripides' *Phoenissae*. For his third version, *Blindeman*, Claus went back to his original adaptation of Seneca's tragedy and gave it an even more personal and modern stamp in a post-apocalyptic setting. Although the characters have different names, the roles of their ancient counterparts are indicated and are closely followed. Claus took the innovation of his previous versions to their extreme: the Jocasta character's hatred of Laius is further developed in the second play as caused not only by his exposure of their son, but also by his homosexuality. Her complicity in and responsibility for the incest are maintained; the chorus, that is the community, who have killed Laius, again manage to persuade Oedipus/Omer that he is the murderer. However, Omer's acceptance of responsibility for the crime and his willingness to atone for his wrongs by blinding himself are again shown to be pointless. The rest of the community, who are guilty, are not even impressed by his sacrifice, nor does it bring about a change in their dire existence. The link with the futility of Christ's sacrifice for mankind was made explicit by Claus specifying Easter as the day on which a nuclear explosion destroyed their former existence. The day of resurrection thus becomes a day of death. This pessimistic view of the moral incapacity of modern man lends a radical sting to Claus' modernisation of the Oedipus myth.

3 **Phaedra**

Seneca's *Phaedra* also underwent a thorough revision by Claus. The adaptation leads to a play which differs from Seneca's in a number of ways. Some of these changes can be attributed to the intertexts which Claus used. As far as the text goes, Claes⁴⁵ proves by the juxtaposition of many excerpts from the Latin, from Watling's English translation and from the Flemish text, that Claus relied in the main on Watling's version. He does, however, also pick out some of the Flemish dialogue that seems to be translated directly from Racine's *Phèdre*. For instance Hippolytus' cry: *Het daglicht is niet reiner dan mijn ziel* (The light of day is not purer than my soul, 59) with which he defends himself against Theseus's accusation that he has raped Phaedra, and which Theseus later repeats in his accusation of Phaedra (70) is a very close translation of Hippolyte's protesta-

45 Claes (1984: 298–99).

tion of innocence in Racine: Le jour n'est pas plus pur que le fond de mon coeur (1112). That said, the more fundamental changes to the structure and characters derive from Claus' own invention, although he was open to ideas drawn from other playwrights.

Claus indicated in an interview that part of his inspiration for his *Phaedra* came from Euripides' *Hippolytus*.⁴⁶ He singled out especially the hatred Hippolytus expresses for women, while Seneca's Hippolytus seemed to him rather to show a general aversion to others, men as well as women. This interpretation seems puzzling as Seneca's Hippolytus does express loathing, fear and hatred of women.⁴⁷ It is not necessary to go to Euripides for that aspect of his characterisation. However, I think Claes is right to ascribe the derivation of the contrast between Diana and Venus evoked in the opening scene of Claus' *Phaedra* (7–9) to the prologue of Euripides' tragedy where the two goddesses are prominent. Claus has structured the opening scene in an original way, but Hippolytus' chastity is clearly linked to Diana, while the worship of Venus anticipates Phaedra's love.

Racine's tragedy provides the name Oenone for the nurse who is unnamed in the ancient plays, but Claus has not followed the French playwright in creating two additional characters, a fiancée and a confidant for Hippolytus. He has, however, provided Hippolytus with friends by replacing Seneca's chorus of women by a group of three hunters who take over some functions of the chorus as well as of the messenger. These hunters also serve as companions to Hippolytus. The effect of this male companionship makes Hippolytus less of the recluse he is in the Roman drama and also enhances the homosexual element, albeit latent, of the character. He enjoys the company of men and misses Theseus, his father, who is absent. This fondness for his father is a new element added by Claus and adds additional poignancy to Theseus's readiness to condemn his son.

Just as he did in *Thyestes* and *Oedipus*, Claus breaks up long monologues into dialogues which are better suited to performance. This is his approach to the opening scene where, instead of Hippolytus' speech of 84 lines, there is a lively exchange between Hippolytus and his hunting companions about practical matters, but also about love, in which Hippolytus' chastity and aversion to women are apparent. Phaedra's monologue follows immediately, but has not been shortened as drastically. Claus keeps to her characterisation of helpless love for Hippolytus and has eroticised some of the hunting imagery,

46 Cited by Claes (1984: 299).

47 Cf. Sen. *Phaedra* 566: *Detestor omnes, horreo fugio execror* (I detest them all, shudder at them, avoid them, curse them.); cf. also further 567–573.

for instance when she desires to be the animal hunted by him and imagines his spear as Een harde speer, gepunt en rond (A hard spear, pointed and round, 12).

Although Claus does not deviate from the basic plot, he structures the action differently in parts. He takes advantage of the greater freedoms permitted by modern staging and sets the second Act before a tent in the mountains. As the young hunters are mocking women, Oenone approaches them, intent on her mission of saving her beloved mistress's life by attempting to tell Hippolytus of her love. In spite of all her endeavours and even those of his comrades, Hippolytus shows no signs of relenting from his hatred and even fear of women (37):

Ik haat ze, ik walg van ze,
ik ben bang voor se.

I hate them, I find them repellent,
I'm afraid of them.

Meyer⁴⁸ notes how well Claus handles scenes where the original may be hard to stage in a credible way. He discusses lines 592–598 where Phaedra, who fainted when she entered the scene and saw Hippolytus, has recovered and is expressing her feelings. These lines should not be overheard by Hippolytus and thus form an aside, but the nurse's words in line 587 indicate that Hippolytus has caught Phaedra and is holding her. In order to prevent this awkwardness, Claus has Oenone preventing Hippolytus from reaching Phaedra and catching her herself (38–39). Meyer notes that a similar solution was adopted by the sixteenth-century French playwright Robert Garnier in his *Hippolyte*. However, Garnier does not have the nurse stopping Hippolytus from aiding *Phèdre*, (1299–1308), she simply deals with her fainting mistress herself and tries to rouse her by indicating the presence of Hippolyte. Garnier's play was clearly known to Racine who made use of some of his innovations in his *Phèdre*, but it seems doubtful that Claus himself made use of the *Hippolyte*.

Another deviation from the Senecan outline is the continued presence of Hippolytus in the play. In the Roman tragedy Hippolytus leaves the stage after the scene where Phaedra reveals her love to him and he threatens to kill her with his dagger. His last words are: o silvae, o ferae! (Oh woods, oh wild creatures! 718) which suggests that he is going off to the forest again. In Claus' version Hippolytus rejoins his hunting companions who gently rib him about his beauty. This provokes him into confessing that Phaedra had also spoken about

48 Meyer (2002: 24–25).

his beauty and that to him, beauty was no more than a curse as it is ephemeral and only causes trouble. This scene emphasises the true character of Claus' Hippolytus. He is asexual, with a preference for the company of men, but does not want to be emotionally involved with anyone. A further innovation in Claus' plot bears this out. On Theseus' return, he encounters Hippolytus, but instead of greeting him, his son runs away. Dramatically this prepares the ground for Phaedra's accusation. Theseus, as in the ancient plays, accepts her version and when Hippolytus appears again, accuses him of the rape of his stepmother and will not listen to his attempts to defend himself. When Hippolytus flees, Theseus pronounces his curse. These new scenes provide splendid material for confrontational dialogue and lively theatre.

Claus has another new scene where Phaedra explains why she let Hippolytus be punished. She could not bear his revulsion from her. He has to pay for the suffering Venus has inflicted on her. Claus avoids the ancient ending in Seneca where the pieces of Hippolytus' body are gathered. His comrades tell Theseus of a female monster from the sea that attacked his son's horse and caused his horrific death. They have brought his body and are mourning him. When Phaedra sees the mangled corpse she confesses her guilt and drinks poison. Here, too, Claus follows Racine and does not have Phaedra stab herself on stage. As in Seneca, Theseus repents of his overhasty action and curses Phaedra. When the stage is empty Claus has Oenone come on again, take Phaedra's head on her lap and add a concluding speech (73–74):

Ik zal hem niet zien,
 maar ooit zal hij komen,
 de witte dag
 van het einde van de wereld,
 als de goden eindelijk de mensen
 hebben verjaagd van de aarde,
 en als het zal zijn zoals het vroeger
 was, zonder schuld, zonder boete,
 leeg, wit, stil, een woestijn zonder
 één klacht.

I will not see it,
 but it will come,
 the white day
 of the end of the world,
 when the gods finally have banished
 humans from the earth,

and when it will be as it was before,
without guilt, without punishment,
empty, white, still, a desert without
a single complaint.

After all the devastation caused by human passion, these words seem to suggest the inevitability of suffering in human life. This is not out of keeping with the conclusion of Claus' other plays.

Both Van der Paardt⁴⁹ and Claes⁵⁰ find Christian allusions in the play, but they are not worked out in any consistent and coherent pattern. Claus himself mentioned in an interview with Marc Reynebeau for *Knack* magazine in 1980, when his *Phaedra* was first produced, that one should acknowledge that all myths touched one another. He maintained that since the Flemish public had grown up with Christianity, it seemed sensible to include some echoes of Christian religion.⁵¹ For the most part, reviewers of the performance were struck by the strong depiction of emotions. Claus succeeded by judicious alteration and simplification of Seneca's play, with the help of further intertexts, in creating a powerful new dramatic version of one of the best known myths of forbidden love.

4 Conclusion

The plays of Hugo Claus that he adapted from Seneca's tragedies must be considered the greatest living memorial to Roman tragedy in the contemporary world. Reading Seneca's tragedies in various translations, and making use, sometimes of Greek dramas depicting the same myths, sometimes of later versions, Claus interpreted the myths in an original way. His new dramas are palimpsestic texts where, with glimpses of other intertexts, the Latin tragedies that underlay them can be seen. With bold imagination and creative stagecraft Claus succeeded in shaping the plays to address themes that are relevant to the modern world. The bleakness of the endings of all the adaptations by Claus shows how the tragic outcomes of the ancient myths may be applied to reflect contemporary crises: possible nuclear catastrophe, ecological disaster, the dangers posed by crowds who select an outsider as scapegoat, and humankind's infinity capacity for hatred and destruction of fellow human beings. By

49 Van Der Paardt (1982: 94–96).

50 Claes (1984: 305–306).

51 *Knack*, 17 September 1980.

Produktie
TONEEL VANDAAG

Inrichting
KUNST- EN CULTUURVERBOND

THYESTES

van HUGO CLAUS
naar de tragedie van SENECA



Regie : H. CLAUS
Muziek : L. DE MEESTER
Akten : F. Beukelaers, R. Bossaerts, M. Duyvelaer, T. Lutz,
H. Niels, H. Van den Berghe, A. Van Royen, R. Van Vlaenderen

Dekor : R. d'HAESE
Kostuums : H. DE CLERCK

Stadsschouwburg — Leuven

Plaatsbespreking : Stadsschouwburg Leuven
Tel. : 016 / 221.13, iedere dag van 10 u. 30 tot
12 u. 30 en van 15 tot 17 uur.

Prijzen der plaatsen : 50, 75, 100 en 125 fr.

DONDERDAG 5 MEI 1966
te 20 u. 30

bringing these problems into prominence through his reinterpretation, Claus invites modern audiences to take a fresh look at the Roman tragedian too.⁵²

⁵² I would like to thank Georges Wildemeersch, head of the Study and Documentation Centre Hugo Claus at Antwerp University for giving me access to the material in their institute. Thanks also to Thomas Crombez for making available a video-recording of Claus' 1966 production of his *Thyestes* and his helpful comments on a draft of this chapter.

T.S. Eliot's Seneca

Gregory A. Staley

In the Renaissance, no Latin author was more highly esteemed than Seneca; in modern times, few authors have been more consistently damned.

T.S. ELIOT, "Seneca in Elizabethan Translation"¹

The great paradox of T.S. Eliot's interest in Senecan tragedy was that Eliot both damned the Roman playwright and at the same time assured him a renewed measure of respect by the very fact of his attention.² In 1927 Eliot wrote two essays about Seneca, both of which were later included in his *Selected Essays*, which were published in 1932 by Faber & Faber in London and by Harcourt in the United States: "Seneca in Elizabethan Translation" and "Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca."³ Eliot's essays give the impression that he was interested in Seneca primarily as a component of the dramatic tradition which culminated in Shakespeare and the Elizabethans, but in fact Eliot was also drawn to Seneca for reasons which become clearer in Eliot's poetry than they do in his prose: as a model for modern verse drama, as a test case for his own debates about philosophy and poetry, and as a venue for the portrayal of heroism in the face of death.

1 I cite Eliot's essays as they appear in his *Selected Essays* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964), which reprints the original edition of 1932 with the addition of a few essays from another collection, his *Essays Ancient and Modern*. This quotation is found on p. 52.

2 As Edmund Wilson (1931: 116) observed, "The extent of Eliot's influence is amazing... The Elizabethan dramatists have come back into fashion, and the nineteenth-century poets have gone out."

3 Eliot's interest in Seneca dates to at least 1922, when he mentions in a letter to the poet and editor Richard Aldington that he is late in producing an article on the topic for Bruce Richmond, editor of the *Times Literary Supplement* (*Letters*, vol. 1, 525). That article, apparently, was never completed but by 1926 (*Letters*, vol. 3, 295) Eliot is corresponding with Charles Whibley, editor of the Tudor Translation Series, about his contribution of an introduction to Thomas Newton, *Seneca, His Tenne Tragedies*, which was published in 1927. Eliot's second essay, "Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca", grew out of his research for that introduction and originated as a lecture presented to the Shakespeare Association on March 18, 1927; it was first published by Oxford University Press for the Association on September 22, 1927.

1 Eliot the Dramatist

... the criticism of Seneca in Mr Eliot's *Agon* is infinitely more alive, more vigorous than in his essay on Seneca.

EZRA POUND⁴

Eliot appears at first to have noticed Seneca as a source for the Elizabethan dramatists Eliot so admired. In "Tradition and the Individual Talent," published in 1919, Eliot had enunciated a central principle of his criticism: "No poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists" (*Selected Essays* 4). To appreciate Shakespeare, therefore, we must appreciate a "dead" Seneca. Eliot also reveals, however, an interest in what we might call a living Seneca, a Seneca whose plays might be revived in Eliot's own time: "His form is a practical form which might be interesting to attempt in our own time, when the revival of the theatre is obstructed by some of the difficulties which made the stage an impossibility in the age of Seneca" (*Selected Essays* 61). Seneca's plays, in which "the drama is all in the word" (*Selected Essays* 54), might be models for drama broadcast on the radio.

It is revealing that Eliot's essays on Seneca came after his composition of his best-known poetry (e.g., "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock," [1915], *The Waste Land* [1922]) and prior to his work as a dramatist (e.g., *Murder in the Cathedral* [1935], *The Family Reunion* [1939]). Eliot was reading Seneca and Shakespeare because he valued verse-drama and wanted to compose it himself. As Peacock has noted, "In Eliot the principles [of dramatic criticism] are not apologia, defensive pleading, but forward projections."⁵ Eliot was interested in Seneca, in short, because he wanted to write drama himself, but drama in verse, poetic drama, a form for which he could not find models in his own time, when plays written in prose by Noël Coward and George Bernard Shaw were in vogue; therefore he looked back to the Renaissance and classical antiquity, to Shakespeare and Seneca.

In his essay "The Possibility of Poetic Drama," written in 1920, Eliot did point to one possible model in the contemporary world for the kind of drama he had in mind: "our problem should be to take a form of entertainment, and subject it to the process which would leave it a form of art. Perhaps the music-hall comedian is the best material."⁶ Traditionally Eliot has been seen as the "priest"

4 "Date Line," in *Make It New: Essays* (1934: 4).

5 Peacock (1977: 110).

6 Published in *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism* (1921: 70).

of poetry, as the defender of high culture in an age of the popular and the decadent. Eliot, however, wanted poetry to be not an erudite form for a few but a popular form for the many: "The ideal medium for poetry," he wrote, "and the most direct means of social 'usefulness' for poetry, is the theatre."⁷ Less than two weeks after the publication of *The Waste Land* Eliot was already thinking about a new form and style that was later manifested in *Sweeney Agonistes*, an uncompleted verse drama eventually published under the titles "Fragment of a Prologue" and "Fragment of an Agon."⁸ Eliot was working on this, his first attempt at drama, during 1926 and 1927, the very years when he was reading and writing about Seneca and the Elizabethan dramatists. Ezra Pound's characterization, quoted at the beginning of this section, of "Mr. Eliot's *Agon*" as the poetic equivalent to Eliot's criticism of Seneca in prose is therefore insightful.

Plays perform a social function and reach a large audience, which would seem to distinguish them from Seneca's "closet dramas," a phrase first used in English in 1822 that describes a play intended to be read in private rather than performed in public. Eliot did not, however, put Senecan tragedy into that category: "... Seneca's is definitely a 'form.' It does not fall within ... the categories, which are defectively dramatic. There are the 'closet dramas' which are mostly simply inferior dramas: the plays of Tennyson, Browning, and Swinburne" (*Selected Essays* 61). Seneca's dramatic words are not, moreover, suited merely to an imperial highbrow audience (*Selected Essays* 54); they have rhythm and are comparable, Eliot tellingly suggests, to the sounds of a minstrel show: "... the characters in a play of Seneca behave more like members of a minstrel troupe sitting in a semicircle, rising in turn each to do his 'number,' or varying their recitations by a song or a little back-chat" (*Selected Essays* 54). Eliot here uses a term from modern comedy to describe a technique which Seneca had mastered: "Several scholars ... have called attention to a trick of Seneca of repeating one word of a phrase in the next phrase, especially in *stichomythia*, where the sentence of one speaker is caught up and twisted by the next. This was an effective stage trick ..." (*Selected Essays* 72).

Eliot's use in *Sweeney Agonistes* of a verbal technique modeled in Seneca, a topic to which we will return shortly, is not the only element that might suggest that Eliot had Seneca in mind in creating his "new form" of drama. Although labeled as "Fragments of an Aristophanic Melodrama," *Sweeney* opens with an epigraph about the Furies and features a protagonist who aspires to be a

7 *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* (1933: 153); for an excellent discussion of this issue, cf. Chinitz (2003).

8 "As for *The Waste Land*, that is a thing of the past as far as I am concerned and I am now feeling toward a new form and style" (*Letters* vol. 1, 596).

"cannibal" and tells a tale of murder. As Chinitz has observed, "Eliot describes Seneca's dramaturgy as a way of writing about 'horrors' (*Selected Essays* 68), and in *Sweeney Agonistes* he adapts Seneca's technique, by way of its minstrel cousin, to deal with his own more metaphysical horrors."⁹ Set in the London apartment of two prostitutes, *Sweeney* explores, in jazz rhythms, popular song, and nightmare visions, what Eliot, in speaking of James Joyce's *Ulysses*, had called "the immense panorama of futility and anarchy which is contemporary history."¹⁰

Pound never articulates how such a drama could be a criticism of Seneca, but we can speculate about the argument he might have given.¹¹ Eliot's achievement in *Sweeney* is to imitate both the virtues and defects of Senecan tragedy. Hugh Kenner has suggested that Doris and Dusty, two prostitutes speaking in Senecan back-chat as they play a game of cards, embody Eliot's notion of Stoicism as a philosophy suited to slaves:¹²

Dusty: It's a funny thing how I draw court cards.
 Doris: There's a lot in the way you pick them up
 Dusty: There's an awful lot in the way you feel
 Doris: Sometimes they'll tell you nothing at all
 Dusty: You've got to know what you want to ask them
 Doris: You've got to know what you want to know
 Dusty: It's no use asking them too much
 Doris: It's no use asking them more than once
 Dusty: Sometime's they're no use at all.¹³

Kenner compares these lines with those which Eliot had quoted from Seneca's *Oedipus* (980–988):¹⁴

Fatis agimur; cedite fatis.
 Non sollicitae possunt curae

9 2003: 113. Cf. Buttram (2009: 182): "... it was, in fact, the horrors of Senecan and kindred later plays that had pushed Eliot's dramatic theory and first play to a new level."

10 "Ulysses," Order and Myth," in *Selected Prose* (1975: 177).

11 According to Hugh Kenner (1959: 226–27), Pound compared the counterpointed rhythm of lines in *Sweeney Agonistes* which described the sound of the telephone (*Complete Poems and Plays*, 75) to lines of Seneca's *Medea* to which Eliot had called his reader's attention (*Selected Essays* 73).

12 1959: 224–27.

13 *Complete Poems and Plays* 77.

14 In "Seneca in Elizabethan Translation," *Selected Essays* 60.

mutare rati stamina fusi.
 quidquid patimur mortale genus,
 quidquid facimus uenit ex alto,
 seruatque suae decreta colus
 Lachesis nulla reuoluta manu.
 omnia secto tramite uadunt
 primusque dies dedit extremum.

We are driven by fate, and must yield to fate.
 No anxious fretting can alter
 the threads from that commanding spindle.
 All that we mortal beings endure,
 all that we do, comes from on high:
 Lachesis secures the decrees of her distaff,
 things that are spun by her harsh hands.
 Everything travels on a path cut for it,
 and the first day decides the last.¹⁵

“[T]o quote Seneca is not criticism”, Eliot remarked (*Selected Essays* 60). To emulate Seneca, however, by creating in Doris and Dusty, a Senecan chorus of sorts, a chorus of ordinary people who “interrogate and evade . . . the future”, as Kenner characterizes their game,¹⁶ is the sort of criticism that Ezra Pound had praised.

Into the world of these Stoics strides Sweeney, the Senecan hero who has seen violence, threatens more, and who confidently asserts that he, without the aid of gods, fate or cards, can make sense of it all. Eliot noted that again and again Seneca inserts into his plays epigrammatic observations on life or death that are put in the most telling way at the most telling moment (*Selected Essays* 59). Right on cue, Sweeney summarizes the meaning of life for Doris: “Birth, copulation, and death. / That’s all the facts when you come to brass tacks.”¹⁷ Sweeney offers to carry Doris off to an island where he will be the cannibal who turns her into a stew, sounding like the Atreus who cooked Thyestes’ children. “[T]he declamatory tenor [in Seneca] could accommodate lines to make one’s flesh creep”, Buttram has argued, a possible source for the “sensitivity to

15 Fitch’s translation in the Loeb series (LCL 78). Unless noted, the other translations are my own.

16 1959: 226.

17 *Complete Poems and Plays* 80.

horror [that] lurks within the tragicomedy of Sweeney and gives it a melodramatic 'thriller' interest."¹⁸

In the fragments of the uncompleted play, however, Sweeney narrates rather than commits violence. He tells Doris, Dusty and their other male guests, "I knew a man once did a girl in—."¹⁹ In what reads almost like a messenger's speech in Seneca, Sweeney describes how this man kept the body of a woman he killed in a bath filled with Lysol. Curious to learn more, one of the guests asks Sweeney, "What did he do?" Sweeney's response adopts the same language which Eliot had used to criticize Senecan tragedy ("... the drama is all in the word, and the word has no further reality behind it" [*Selected Essays* 54]): "Talk to live men about what they do... But I've gotta use words when I talk to you... But if you understand or if you don't / That's nothing to me and nothing to you."²⁰ Sweeney comes across as a Senecan character who has read Eliot's characterization of Senecan drama.

Rainey has argued that Eliot had two different poetics: a poetics of classicism, officially proclaimed, and a poetics of the histrionic, practiced in his own poetry during the early 1920's and occasionally thereafter. The histrionic Eliot was interested in "[t]he strange, the surprising, the fantastic and in intensity and violence."²¹ The Seneca who seemed wanting by the standards of classicism in Eliot's essays proved to be far more congenial to Eliot's histrionic instincts in *Sweeney Agonistes*.

2 Eliot the Philosopher

Poetry is not a substitute for philosophy or theology or religion... it has its own function. But as this function is not intellectual but emotional, it cannot be defined adequately in intellectual terms.

"Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca" (*Selected Essays* 118)

Eliot's polemic against the idea that poetry might be a form of philosophy sounds somewhat Platonic, although Plato abandoned poetry to become a philosopher whereas Eliot abandoned philosophy to become a poet. Eliot's literary criticism highlights the distinction which must be drawn between philosophy and poetry, yet his poetry consistently imports what can only be described as

18 2009: 182.

19 *Complete Poems and Plays* 82.

20 *Complete Poems and Plays* 83–84.

21 2009: 308–309.

the language of philosophical discourse.²² Eliot's reading of Seneca's Stoicism, therefore, reflects his own ambivalence about the two intellectual traditions on which his career was built.

Even as a student at Harvard Eliot was searching through his poetry for a philosophy of life; there he read Santayana's *Three Philosophical Poets*, which examined Lucretius, Dante, and Goethe. It was in Paris, however, in 1911, that Eliot decided to study philosophy to help him find the truth of his time, as Gordon has suggested.²³ Returning to Harvard, Eliot wrote a dissertation titled *Knowledge and Experience in the Philosophy of F.H. Bradley*, which he completed in 1916. It was a fellowship to continue his philosophical studies in Germany and Great Britain that brought Eliot back to what was to be his European homeland for the rest of his life. There he met Ezra Pound, whose encouragement, coupled with Eliot's increasing distaste for the academic study of philosophy, led Eliot back to the profession of poet.

We need to understand Eliot's background in philosophy in order to assess his otherwise puzzling and contradictory statements about Seneca and Stoicism. The second of Eliot's essays on Seneca originated as a talk for the Shakespeare Association and grew out of his earlier introduction to Elizabethan translations of Seneca's plays: "What I find I should really like to talk about is 'Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca' . . . it is . . . a subject suggested by the work I have been doing."²⁴ In his earlier essay, Eliot had introduced the topic of Stoicism in his attempt to explain the shallowness of Seneca's characters, their crudity and simplicity. Beyond that point, however, Eliot was not prepared to go: "it would be futile to attempt to decide what in the dialogue and characterization of Seneca's plays, is due to Stoicism, what due to the Roman mind, and what due to the peculiar form which Seneca elected" (*Selected Essays* 57). It is perhaps with the sense that he had not treated the issue of Seneca's Stoicism adequately that Eliot returned to it in his second essay.

Even there, Eliot's discussion remains, however, ambivalent and noncommittal: "I propose a Shakespeare under the influence of the stoicism of Seneca. But I do not believe that Shakespeare was under the influence of Seneca . . . a stoical or Senecan Shakespeare is almost certain to be produced. I wish merely to disinfect the Senecan Shakespeare before he appears" (*Selected Essays* 109).²⁵ As he was in his more famous essay on Vergil as a classic, Eliot is here guided

22 On this point, cf. Mallinson (2002: 2).

23 1999: 63.

24 *Letters* (vol. 3, 349).

25 Cf. Hartford (1990) for an analysis of the equivocality of Eliot's discussion of Stoicism in Shakespeare.

in large part by the scholarly sources on which he drew: Cunliffe's *The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy* (1893) and Lucas' *Seneca and Elizabethan Tragedy* (1922), both of which he acknowledges in his essay.²⁶ Matthews notes that "[t]he complex presence of a stoical attitude, derived for the Elizabethan dramatists from Seneca, had been a staple of the criticism of the earlier period for quite a time before Eliot took it up in the mid-1920's."²⁷ Why, then, would Eliot, in a talk to the Shakespeare Association, raise, as if something new, a subject long acknowledged and about which he was somewhat muddled?

Eliot had found, he thought, something quite "modern" in Seneca's plays: the attitude of self-dramatization assumed by heroes at moments of tragic intensity: "... there is, in some of the tragedies of Shakespeare, a new attitude. It is not the attitude of Seneca, but is derived from Seneca ... it is modern, and it culminates ... in the attitude of Nietzsche" (*Selected Essays*, 110). Here Eliot draws on Lucas' assertion that "in Seneca himself, Stoicism induced an egotistic hardness" and on Cunliffe's claim that Seneca "is the most modern of the ancients."²⁸ As we have now come to appreciate more fully, Seneca's plays are intensely aware of their status as plays; characters such as Atreus stage within Seneca's play their own dramas as they play the part of actor, scriptwriter and audience: *questibus uanis agis / iratus Atreus?*, "with empty complaints are you acting the role of an angry Atreus?" (*Thyestes* 179–180). Bartsch has shown that this attitude, that of the performative self, was a pervasive feature of the Neronian age, when the emperor himself appeared on stage and when those around him had to mask their real selves behind parts they played to suit him.²⁹

In such a world the hero was the one who through his will to power created and dominated his own world. It is striking that Eliot connects Seneca with Nietzsche in this regard. Eliot had been reading Nietzsche in 1915–1916; although he subsequently mentions the German philosopher only in "Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca," the two shared important affinities: both argued that contemporary culture had lost the unity of art and society demonstrated by the Greeks and that a revival of the tragic theater was a means by which to reconnect them. Leavell³⁰ has suggested that Eliot, in his desire to bridge this

26 In a letter written on November 25, 1926 (*Letters* vol. 3, 323), Eliot indicated that he did not want to "re-hash" issues about Seneca's influence on Shakespeare which had already been adjudicated but instead "to deal with things that have been neglected or ill-treated in literary criticism."

27 2013: 134.

28 Lucas (1922: 59); Cunliffe (1893: 15).

29 Bartsch 1994.

30 1985.

gap, enacted in his later dramas Nietzsche's theory of tragedy. In a Roman and Stoic world where the "dissociation of sensibility",³¹ the separation of thought from feeling, had become the norm, the self-dramatizing hero who proclaims that "I am myself alone" offers the only alternative to the unified world of the Greek city-state or to Christian theology.³² Nietzsche, who in some ways admired the Stoics, thus becomes the most conspicuous modern instance of cheering oneself up in the fashion demonstrated by Seneca's heroes and emulated by Shakespeare's. Here Eliot seems to recall Nietzsche's characterization of the Stoic in *Daybreak*: "There is a cheerfulness peculiar to the Stoic: he experiences it whenever he feels hemmed in by the formalities he himself has prescribed for his conduct; he then enjoys the sensation of himself as dominator."³³

The disassociation of sensibility was Eliot's term for the gap between thought and feeling but more generally for the ancient quarrel between philosophy and poetry. It began in Athens with the Socratic revolution when, as Cooper has noted, the epiphanic, visionary, and imaginative activities of the mind were ruled out of order by the new philosophy as a path toward truth.³⁴ After trying philosophy as a means by which to understand life and failing, Eliot turned instead to poetry and became hostile to poets who claimed to be thinkers. The poet makes poetry, the metaphysician makes metaphysics, Eliot asserts (*Selected Essays* 118); but, as Habib³⁵ has demonstrated, Eliot ultimately recognized that poetry is a metaphysical task: the direct sensuous apprehension of thought, or a recreation of thought into feeling (*Selected Essays* 246).

The second half of Eliot's essay on Shakespeare and Stoicism is focused not so much on Stoicism itself as on an implication of its presence in Shakespeare's plays: was Shakespeare a thinker? Eliot quotes Lewis' argument that Shakespeare was:

31 Eliot introduces this term in "The Metaphysical Poets" (*Selected Essays* 247) to characterize "the difference between the intellectual poet and the reflective poet."

32 Cf. *Selected Essays* 112: "A man does not join himself to the Universe so long as he has anything else to join himself with; men who could take part in the life of a thriving Greek city-state had something better to join themselves to; and Christians have had something better. Stoicism is the refuge for the individual in an indifferent or hostile world too big for him; it is the permanent substratum of a number of versions of cheering oneself up."

33 1982: §251. Eliot was reading Nietzsche in 1915, as he notes in a letter to his mother (*Letters* vol. 1, 120): "As for the book on Nietzsche, I have finished it, and now am reading some of Nietzsche's works which I had not read before, and which I ought to read anyhow before my examinations."

34 Cooper (2006: 38); Eliot had dated the emergence of this disassociation to the seventeenth century (*Selected Essays* 247), but the stage for it was set in antiquity.

35 1999: 209.

Shakespeare is the only thinker we meet with among the Elizabethan dramatists. By this is meant, of course, that his work contained, apart from poetry, phantasy, rhetoric or observation of manners, a body of matter representing explicit processes of the intellect which would have furnished a moral philosopher like Montaigne with natural material for his essays. (*Selected Essays* 114–15)

Eliot objects to this view because he does not believe that Shakespeare “thought to any purpose” or “that he had any coherent view of life” (*Selected Essays* 115). By contrast, Lewis suggests that Shakespeare depicts in his characters the mind at work in a way that a philosopher could use as evidence for his epistemology or psychology.³⁶ I have argued that Seneca was a thinker in just this sense and that he used poetry in his own essays as evidence of the unseen workings of the mind.³⁷

Ironically, when Eliot says (*Selected Essays* 57) that it would be futile to identify what is Stoic in Seneca’s plays, he implicitly acknowledges that Seneca was not a thinker but a poet. In his essay, “The Metaphysical Poets,” published in 1921, at the time when he was himself turning increasingly from philosophy to poetry, Eliot articulates the proper relationship between these two spheres of interest: “It is not a permanent necessity that poets should be interested in philosophy”, he writes, but “the more intelligent [the poet] is the better.” This philosopher, however, must “turn [his philosophical interests] into poetry, and not merely meditate on them poetically” (*Selected Essays* 248). Eliot goes on to cite Racine and Baudelaire as examples of this ideal, two masters of diction who are also the greatest psychologists, the most curious explorers of the soul (*Selected Essays* 249). Racine and Donne (Eliot’s favorite) succeeded as psychologists because they looked at more than the heart: “One must look into the cerebral cortex, the nervous system, and the digestive tracts” (*Selected Essays* 250).

Seneca shared this sense that the psychologist *must* look deep inside, *must* perform on humans the sort of exploration which the Romans traditionally performed on animals:

animus si ostendi et si in ulla materia perlucere posset, intuentis nos confunderet ater maculosusque et aestuans et distortus et tumidus . . . quod si nudus ostenderetur?

36 Lewis’ mention of Montaigne is revealing; Montaigne had indeed used Seneca as a model and quoted from him often.

37 2010: 66–72.

If the soul could be shown, if it were in any material through which it might be visible, it would trouble us as we looked at it, black, spotted, seething, misshapen and swollen. . . . what if the soul could be shown bare?³⁸

Poetry offered a way to do that, as Seneca shows in this same essay, his *De ira* ("Concerning Anger"), when he cites, just before the words I quote above, the monsters which poets imagine, the Furies and creatures of the underworld, as images of the angry man's soul (2.35.5). Moreover, Seneca writes poetry of that sort himself, as we can see most clearly in his *Oedipus*. There (299–391) the seer Tiresias performs literally the sort of *extispicium* (examination of the entrails) that is Seneca's metaphor for tragedy's exploration of the soul. Tiresias' search for truth is quite literally scrutiny, the probing of the hidden and inward. For Seneca scrutiny is in its primary sense an act of *extispicium* that only metaphorically becomes an act of self-analysis. In his philosophical prose Seneca employed the same verb, *scrutari*, which in the play (372, 965) has a sense of physical probing, to describe the intellectual process of *meditatio* which can lead to self-knowledge: *excute te et uarie scrutare et obserua* ("examine and probe and observe yourself in a variety of ways", *Epistulae morales* 16.2).³⁹ His *Oedipus* returns to the reality behind the metaphor.

Eliot's difficulty in understanding what is Stoic about Senecan tragedy is a consequence in large part of his failure to perceive that Seneca shared Eliot's own antipathy to didactic poetry. Although the Stoics generally viewed poetry as a vehicle for education, Seneca was not an orthodox Stoic on this subject. He contrasts the stage as the setting for pleasure with the philosopher's classroom as the venue for instruction; he doubts the value of poetry as a textbook for philosophy in the schools; and he rejects allegory as a vehicle for converting poetry into wisdom.⁴⁰ Much of what Eliot says about poetry and thinking in fact works better with Seneca than Eliot perceives: "The poet who 'thinks' is merely the poet who can express the emotional equivalent of thought. But he is not necessarily interested in the thought itself" (*Selected Essays* 115). As a Stoic psychologist interested in the role of emotion in human experience, Seneca wrote the kinds of tragedies that his Stoic predecessors had read in their attempt to understand the hidden human soul. Chrysippus, one of the fathers of Stoicism, had lamented that the soul was inaccessible and turned

38 *De ira* 2.36.2.

39 For a more detailed discussion, cf. Staley (2014).

40 See my discussion of these issues in chapter two of *Seneca and the Idea of Tragedy*.

to poetry because "the poet . . . says more than enough about these (things)."⁴¹ Seneca understood "the emotional equivalent of thought," since as a Stoic he interpreted all emotion as a misguided form of "thinking"; yet he sought in his plays not to teach the thought but to portray it.⁴²

Eliot was of one mind with the Stoics in his assertion that thought begins with sensation. Contrasting Rudyard Kipling with H.G. Wells, Eliot observed: "Kipling did not, even in the sense that activity can be ascribed to Wells, *think*: his aim, and his gift, is to make people see—for the first condition of right thought is right sensation" (*On Poetry and Poets* 289). In a similar way, the Stoics privileged sensation as the foundation of knowledge and highlighted those images that are particularly vivid as a native feature of poetry. Longinus (as he is traditionally known), a contemporary of Seneca, defined the term *phantasia* (visualization, the Stoics favored term for a sense impression) as the name for passages in poetry where, inspired by strong emotion, you seem to see what you describe and bring it vividly before the eyes of your audience (*On the Sublime* 15.1). Longinus draws almost all of his vivid scenes from tragedy, a sign that the Stoic sources that defined the term for him also suggested the venue for his examples. Longinus' first example, drawn from Euripides, also had an appeal for Eliot: Orestes' vision of the Furies. Eliot had used a similar passage from Aeschylus as one of his epigraphs to *Sweeney Agonistes*: "Orestes: You don't see them, you don't—but *I* see them: they are hunting me down, I must move on."⁴³ Seneca's characters regularly see the Furies in just this way, thereby enabling his audience to see them, too.

When Eliot condemned Seneca's tragedies as "one remove from reality" with "the drama . . . all in the word" (*Selected Essays* 53–54), he was, of course, thinking of Seneca's plays as works for the ears rather than for the eyes, as drama to be recited rather than performed. Where he went astray, however, was in thinking that Seneca's words did not have behind them "a concrete visual actuality" and "a specific emotional actuality" (*Selected Essays* 53). Sensibility was in

41 Galen, *On the Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato*, iii.1.15 and iv.1.17, attributes these words to Chrysippus.

42 There has been a long debate, which goes back to the time of their rediscovery in the fourteenth century, about the purpose of Seneca's plays. At the time it was assumed that all literature was intended to teach and so the plays were read as lessons, a tendency only strengthened once it was realized that Seneca the philosopher and Seneca the poet were the same man. This debate has continued in recent scholarship but the consensus now is that Seneca approached his plays as a poet whose perspective on the world was largely but not completely Stoic.

43 Longinus cites lines from Euripides' *Orestes* (255–257); Eliot's lines come from the *Choephoroi* (1061–1062).

Seneca's epistemology and dramaturgy not dissociated. Even though Seneca's plays were not intended for performance, Goldberg argues, the rhetorical principles on which they were constructed used words to enable the mind to see.⁴⁴ As Quintilian (8.3.62) observed in a passage which Goldberg cites, "speech does not adequately fulfill its purpose or attain the total domination it should have if it goes no further than the ears, and the judge feels that he is merely being told the story of the matters he has to decide, without their being brought out and displayed to his mind's eye."⁴⁵

Eliot would have been better able to appreciate the relationship between Stoicism and Senecan tragedy had he applied to Seneca the principle he advocated when speaking of Kipling: "a knowledge of his prose is essential to the understanding of his verse, and a knowledge of his verse is essential to the understanding of his prose" (*On Poetry and Poets* 265).

3 Eliot the Man

Why, for all of us, out of all that we have heard, seen, felt, in a lifetime, do certain images recur, charged with emotion, rather than others?

The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism 141

Eliot asks this question in the conclusion to a series of lectures he gave at Harvard in 1932–1933, after quoting lines from Chapman's play, *Bussy D'Ambois*, lines which he had used before and would use again, lines which, he acknowledges, are modeled on Seneca's tragedy, *Hercules Oetaeus*.⁴⁶

Bussy D'Ambois, a French nobleman, proclaims his fearlessness in the face of death and predicts his undying fame throughout the world:

The equall thought I beare of life and death
Shall make me faint on no side; I am up.
Here, like a Roman statue, I will stand
Till death hath made me marble. O my fame

44 2000: 223–25.

45 *Non enim satis efficit neque, ut debet, plene dominatur oratio si usque ad aures valet atque ea sibi iudex de quibus cognoscit narrari credit, non exprimi et oculis mentis ostendi.* This translation is taken from Russell's Loeb (LCL 126).

46 Although influenced by Seneca's tragedies, *Hercules Oetaeus* was written, most scholars now agree, by a hand other than Seneca's. For an alternative reading, which views the play as an uncompleted first draft by Seneca, cf. Konstan's chapter in this volume.

Live in despatch of murder! take thy wings
 And haste thee where the gray-ey'd morn perfumes
 Her rosie chariot with Sabæan spices!
 Fly where the evening from th'Iborean vales
 Takes on her swarthy shoulders Heccate
 Crown'd with a grove of oakes! flie where men feeble
 The burning axeltree; and those that suffer
 Beneath the chariot of the snowy Beare:
 And tell them all that D'Ambois now is hasting
 To the eternall dwellers . . . (V.3.138–151)

"Chapman borrowed this," Eliot notes (*Use of Poetry* 147), "from Seneca's *Hercules Oetaeus*," where the chorus reacts to Hercules' impending death by calling on the Sun to announce his demise throughout the world:

dic sub Aurora positis Sabaeis
 dic sub occasu positis Hiberis
 quique sub plaustro patiuntur ursae
 quique ferventi quatiuntur axe . . .

tell the Sabaeans beside the dawn,
 tell the Spaniards beside the sunset,
 and those who are shaken by your blazing chariot
 or suffer beneath the Bear's own Wain . . .
 (1521–1524)⁴⁷

From very early on in his life, Eliot was fascinated by the theme of death and of Stoic heroism in the face of it, as Matthews has recently shown.⁴⁸ Why did Senecan images of these issues, mediated through Chapman and Shakespeare, regularly recur in Eliot's work? Why was Eliot, both as poet and critic, drawn to Seneca's words and images?

Eliot could not answer his own question, for an author's imagery, he suggests, "come[s] to represent the depths of feeling into which we cannot peer" (*The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* 141). Yet there is much in Bussy D'Ambois' death scene and in its Senecan sources which might suggest an answer, for Seneca himself died in just the manner which Eliot came to admire in the

47 I use the translation in Fitch's Loeb edition (LCL 78) of the play.

48 2013: 1–6; Eliot referred to Chapman's play in his poetry and prose written in 1917, in *Burnt Norton*.

Senecan deaths which we meet in *Hercules Oetaeus* and later in Chapman and Shakespeare. Key lines in Chapman's play point us to Seneca's life as well as to his words: "Here, like a Roman statue, I will stand / Till death hath made me marble." Chapman alludes, I suggest, to the Roman tradition of commemorating the dead through statues and busts, which appeared as portrait reliefs on tombs, portrait busts beside the urn containing the deceased's ashes, and *imagines* or death masks, which were displayed in noble Roman homes.

As Matthews suggests, the Roman nature of Chapman's statue is a clue that points to the Senecan intertext behind the scene; that intertext, however, includes not just Hercules but Seneca himself, who died the sort of noble and Stoic death that Eliot admired and who, unlike Hercules, was commemorated in death by an *imago* which he bequeathed to his friends.⁴⁹ Tacitus reports in *Annals* 15.62 that Seneca, in his last days, bequeathed to his friends the image of his life and this scene was well known in England during these years, both through Montaigne's summary of it in his essays and through Greneway's translation of the *Annals*. As a result, Chapman would undoubtedly have been familiar with the scene. Ker has demonstrated in his book, *The Deaths of Seneca*, that Seneca's death scene had a rich afterlife in literature, art, and philosophy and was widely known in the early modern period.⁵⁰ One of the ways in which Seneca's *imago* was preserved was in a portrait bust, a double herm of Seneca and Socrates, which was rediscovered in a Roman suburban villa in 1813.⁵¹ Although Chapman could not have known of this herm, he was more generally familiar with Roman "statue[s]" which "death hath made . . . marble," a tradition which D'Ambois wished to emulate and which Seneca embodied in his life.

When Eliot highlighted self-dramatization as a Stoic aspect of Shakespeare's heroes (*Selected Essays* 110–111), he cited the example of Othello, who in his last speech (Act v, scene ii, 388–406) asked that Ludovico "speak of me as I am" and record in his letters Othello's services to the state as well as his personal failings. Then Othello took his life. Although Seneca was in personality a very different man from Othello, he created in his death just this kind of scene, as Seneca performed the role of a Stoic hero dying in a tragic guise. Epictetus (1.4.24) had recommended a death of this sort as a Stoic corrective to the tragic deaths of heroes. In his focus on death scenes, Eliot seems to have intuited their centrality to the Stoic and Senecan definition of theater: the self is a character, a *persona*, in a play, performing before an audience which holds it

49 Matthews (2013: 4).

50 See especially chapter nine: "Passing into Memory: Seneca's *Imago* and its Reproduction."

51 For an image and a brief discussion of the Seneca-Socrates bust, cf. Ker (2009: 182–3).

accountable, seeking in death to give its story a good ending: *Quomodo fabula, sic vita... tantum bonam clausulam impone*, "Life is like a play... just give it a good ending" (Seneca, *Epistulae morales* 77.20).⁵²

Eliot's recurring interest in Seneca, I suggest, ultimately derived from their shared interests and personalities. Writers in poetry and prose, master wordsmiths, Eliot and Seneca longed for the stern wisdom to be found in Christianity or Stoicism. In poems written during his student years at Harvard, Eliot was drawn to the image of the martyr in the figures of Saint Sabastian and Saint Narcissus;⁵³ Seneca had himself been transformed into just such a martyr.⁵⁴ Moody has noted that "there is a striking correspondence between Seneca's two Hercules plays... and certain essential features of Eliot's own Christianity."⁵⁵ Writing in 1919, Eliot spoke of the bond which can exist between authors: "This relation is a feeling of profound kinship, or rather of a peculiar personal intimacy, with another, probably a dead author..."⁵⁶ Eliot's relationship with Seneca was not profound, but it was personal and reflected their common sense that writing was a path towards a meaningful life.

52 Cf. Edwards, (2007: 144–60).

53 Cf. Gordon (1999: 34).

54 Ker (2009: 214) shows, for example, that Rubens' painting of a dying Seneca assimilated him to the iconography of the St. Sebastian type of martyr. The editor has pointed out to me that Rubens painted this portrait himself and kept it in his studio for inspiration, where it appears in the background of two of Rubens' paintings of his studio.

55 Moody (1994: 158). Eliot uses a line from Seneca's *Hercules furens* (1138) as the epigraph to his poem *Marina*: *Quis hic locus, quae regio, quae mundi plaga?* ("What place is this, what region, what corner of the world?"). The *Hercules Oetaeus* portrays the end of Hercules' life as his body is burned and his soul ascends to heaven. Moody (1994: 158) suggests that Eliot "might well have reflected of Hercules as he did of Baudelaire, that 'the recognition of the reality of Sin is a New Life.' Seneca's later play [Moody attributes *Hercules Oetaeus* to Seneca] can be read as a fulfillment of that idea."

56 "Reflections on Contemporary Poetry," *Egoist* 6 (July 1919) 39, cited by Habib (1999: 164).

Afterword



A Day at the Races Theatre: The Spectacle of Performance in the Roman Empire

George W.M. Harrison

1 Multi-event, Less Multi-purpose

The distance between performance and recitation of drama (as opposed to what is considered “recitation drama” or “closet drama”) must be collapsed. “Full, formal performance” should still be thought to entail the booking of a stage and dates, the hiring of actors, rehearsals, and the cost of costumes. For this there is plenty of inscriptional evidence from the provinces and more importantly the Roman festival (*ludi*) calendar, many games of which had funds entailed for the production of plays.¹ Beyond that, what constitutes “performance” is slippery.² Beacham³ has shown that the space inside grand Roman houses rendered themselves “theatrical” for the morning audience and other events in which the owner advertised his prestige and culture.⁴ For full, formal performance, plays and the theatres in which they were put on were so much an important and potent symbol of imperial authority that the decorative programs were well thought out and the decoration embodied the range of programs that could take place in theatres. The decoration, thus, framed the ambience of the event and in real ways “pre-*author*-ised” the reception of what was presented. This afterword will try to make vivid what it must have felt like to be in a state-sponsored event in a theatre. Since the evidence presented here is a sum of what can be collected from numerous sources, any one specific event would probably have many of the elements cited below but few, if any, would have all.

1 Cf., esp., Cowan in this volume.

2 Cf., esp., in this volume Kohn, Slaney, van Zyl Smit and Staley.

3 Beacham (2013) in Harrison and Liapis, *Performance in Greek and Roman Theatre*.

4 Conversely what constituted “gladiatorial bouts” is also pliable. Aside from formal settings, they could and did take place in many other places, such as even in the *cenaculum*; cf., e.g., Historia augusta Life of Verus 5.1 which states that Verus watched pairs over dinner in his dining room. The *cena* of Trimalchio is more performance than food.

The prominence of theatres as physical and cultural landmarks⁵ is beyond dispute nor has there ever been any doubt that Roman theatres were used for a series of spectacles. The cumulative weight of inscriptional evidence, art and archaeological remains, and literary citations proves that theatres also “staged” water ballet and other aquatic spectacles, single pairs of gladiators, boxing, beast hunts (*venationes*), Atellan farce, mime, and pantomime at the very least. There is even compelling evidence for revival of satyr dramas in theatres and *odeia* and two ancient eye witnesses place the immolation on stage of condemned criminals portraying Hercules, circumstantial but compelling evidence of an execution paired with a performance of Sophocles’ *Trachiniae* or the *Hercules Oetaeus* in the second century, AD.⁶ It would be easy to think of Roman theatres as “multi-purpose” facilities on the analogy of modern complexes which can host a sports event one night, a concert the next, and ice follies on the day following,⁷ which would disassociate one type of event from another kind of performance, and has a tendency to restrict the misting of perfume (*sparsio*) or hurling of gifts (*missiles*) to the kind of events where controlling stench or distributing souvenir items would have been an attractive addition, or perhaps even practical necessity. This is not always the case: in Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 10.34, for example, the mist of saffron-infused white wine occurred during a mime on the Judgement of Paris and so was entirely for the audience’s delectation. Similarly, in the theatre at Cirta (Algeria), the

5 Cf. Painter (1975) on theatres etched on glass flasks. Theatres were a *sine qua non* of establishing a civic identity. Much is still owed to the seminal book on Roman theatre-temples by J.A. Hanson (1959).

6 To be consistent, theatre always refers to a large, open-air structure and *odeum* to a smaller roofed facility. The number of variant spellings of *odeum* is a clue that this venue was possibly of less importance for performance, so ORDION on a flask (Painter 1975 #5) and HODIUM at Cosa (Collins-Clinton 2000: 205).

Horace (*Epistles* 2.2.124) reported seeing a performance of a satyr drama and discussed satyr drama in the present tense as a contemporary genre (*Ars Poetica* 220–50). Their frequency must have been substantial since Vitruvius (5.6.9) considered ‘satyric’ (i.e., woodland setting) one of the three standard backdrops. Even so, Smolenaars’ surmise (1983) that the *scaenicum exodium* (Suetonius, *Domitian* 10.4) as part of which Helvidius Priscus the Younger was executed was a satyr drama must be doubted. *Paris and Oenone* would seem more likely a mime based on Ovid’s *Heroides* than either a satyr drama or farce.

7 Even for current entertainment, this analogy is largely restricted to large venues and mass appeal events. Smaller venues have a much more limited scope and a greater amount of time required between events.

sparsiones are tied to *missiles* at *ludi scaenici* (i.e., plays), and not *venationes* or a *gladiatorium munus*.⁸

Performance of tragedies during the Roman Empire, however, seems to have been part of a 'multi-event' production in which several types of entertainment were sequenced together taking up most or all of an entire day. Seneca's *Epistulae morales* 7 gives the order of offerings in the arena: *venationes* in the morning, executions at lunchtime, and gladiators in the afternoon; a similar practice for the theatre should be inferred even if it is probable that single events doubtless sometimes were presented in theatres.⁹ The *Calendarium publicum populi romani* of Furius Dionysius Philocalus for AD 354 yields 10 days on which gladiatorial combats were presented, 64 with horse racing, and 101 with theatre performances. There were so many days with theatrical performances that a *Novella* of Justinian forbade the urban procurator from attending performances the entire day; rather, he was restricted to the morning so that he could attend to his duties the rest of the day. An inscription from Sitifis in Algeria (CIL 8.8438), dated to the reign of Nerva,¹⁰ honours the distribution of *sportula* to *decuriones* attending the *ludi scaenici*. As *sportula* in the morning audience at Rome generally comprised a basket of food with a *quadrans* for admission to the baths,¹¹ one assumption would be that the town grandees in attendance received something to eat during their daylong enjoyment of the proceedings, much as Seneca's citizens at the arena ate lunch over executions.

Although one might consider that plays in succession could occupy an entire day, or according to the calendar, the entire day for one-in-three days over the whole year, year-in-and-year-out, with so many days with plays it is not unlikely that "theatrical performances" meant day long entertainment of different varieties taking place within an open or covered theatre. Justinian's *Novella* 105 of 536 AD supports such an interpretation: the statute stipulates the types of entertainments the consuls were to present during their term of office. Various events, such as the formal processions of magistrates entering

8 There is, inevitably, room for confusion: a gladiatorial combat properly is termed *munus* harkening back to its origins as a gift to the deceased; *ludus*, when applied to gladiators, should be restricted in sense to gladiatorial schools, such as the *Ludus magnus* in Rome, attached to the Flavian amphitheatre by a tunnel.

9 Similarly, the *Circus Maximus*, as other horse racing parks, offered plays in the curved end (*sphendon*), and also music and skits between races. Theatres, like circuses and arenas, rented the exterior space on the ground floor for merchants, such as the Theatre of Marcellus at Rome and Theatre of Balbus at Rome. Sear (2006: 396) surmises that the Theatre of the Athenians at Eleusis was in the *sphendon* of the stadium (running track).

10 Sear (2006: 272).

11 The main evidence is Martial; cf. Harrison (2001).

and leaving office, and horse racing (twice during their term), and wild beast hunts in the amphitheatre (one day only) are restricted in place and frequency. The section on theatre (§5) stipulates mime; tragedy; music, song, dance [= pantomime?]. Other shows, such as acrobats, tight-rope walkers,¹² fireworks, and even *naumachiae* (presumably in a flooded orchestra) are included in the section of what took place in theatres. It is significant that all of the activities mentioned in this law have epigraphical support for the Roman Empire, except fireworks.¹³ This accords with Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 10.29–35, in which Lucius as an ass is meant to penetrate a murderess condemned to execution *ad bestias* (*Metamorphoses* 10.23). The extravaganza starts with a mime, followed by a Pyrrhic dance by ephebes, followed by a mime on the Judgement of Paris. What would have followed is not reported because Lucius, despairing what effect having sex with a convicted murderess would have on his future potency, takes advantage of an opportunity to melt away. An inscription from the theatre at Selge, Turkey, honours the priest of the imperial cult for sponsoring theatrical spectacles, gladiatorial combats and *venationes* all at the same time.¹⁴

There was never at Rome, either in the Republic or Empire, a tradition of staging multiple tragedies or comedies in a row.¹⁵ From the very beginning in the Republic, tragedy was associated with an *exodium* (“after piece”) that was most often, but not exclusively an Atellan farce.¹⁶ One fragment remains of an Atellan farce titled *Exodium*, ascribed to Novius (*fl.* 95 BC–80 BC):¹⁷

12 An inscription in the theatre at Delphi records a tight-rope walker, an acrobat, and a rope-dancer. Tight-rope walkers are known from an inscription in the theatre at Aphrodisias. It is ironic that Terence in his prologue to the *Hecyra* complains that a prior attempt at performance had to be abandoned because of a tight-rope walker. It is beyond dispute that at the time of Terence, acrobatics and plays were in competition with one another for attention in the *forum romanum* for an audience (Gebhard 1975: 43–44, among others). In the Empire, however, it appears that they could on certain occasions become part of the same extravaganza. Plays could have potentially been put on in Rome as early as 364 BC in the Circus Maximus as part of the *Ludi romani*. By contrast the first gladiatorial pair belongs to Junian *munus funebre* of 264 BC; *venationes* do not appear in Rome until the *ludus triumphalis* of M. Fulvius Nobilior in 186 BC, significantly the year of the Dionysiac scandal.

13 Fireworks, however, are mentioned by Apuleius in *Metamorphoses* 10.34.

14 Sear (2006: 377).

15 Even at the major Athenian festivals, there would have been no more than 4 plays as part of the tragic-satyr play suite or 5 comedies on a single day.

16 Livy 7.2.11; Valerius Maximus 2.4.4; Horace, *Epistles* 2.1.139–163; discussed by Lowe (2007: 82).

17 Cited in Frasinetti (1967); on the farce writers Pomponius and Novius; cf. Bakhtin (1981: 56).

puerum mulieri praestare nemo nescit, quanto melior
sit cuius vox gallulascit, cuius iam ramus roborascit.

no one knows how preferable to be a boy than a woman, by how much
his voice may be better [when he] grows “short and curls”, whose
branch already gets stiff as oak.

References to farce, and mime, performed as an afterpiece cluster especially around the empire, such as Juvenal on women as crazed for actors of all kinds (6.71) and Suetonius in his lives of Tiberius (§45), Nero (§45), and Domitian (§10).¹⁸ Plutarch, writing in the Empire, reported in the *Life of Crassus* 33 that his severed head was brought to dinner and the tragic actor Jason of Tralles used the head as a prop in reciting scenes from Euripides’ *Bacchae*. Plutarch’s dry comment was that this farce was the *exodium* to the tragedy of Crassus’ expedition.

As part of the *ludi scaenici* there is evidence that in addition to *sportula* for the *decuriones*, mentioned above, presents could be thrown to the audience (*missiles*). The theatre at Cirta in Algeria¹⁹ preserves 10 inscriptions, three of which (*CIL* 8.6944; 8.19489, 8.19513) mention plays on the stage (*ludi scaenici*), and 5 that honour *ludi scaenici cum missilibus* (*CIL* 8.6947–8; 8.7000; 8.70958; 8.7122; 8.7963).²⁰ A. Aemilius Ballator commemorated his *ludi cum missilibus* (*CIL* 8.7960) at Rusicada, Algeria, with two statues. It is impossible to know what Aurelianus did to keep people amused with exotic spectacles (Panormus, Sicily; *CIL* 10.7295) but distribution of some kind is possible.

At some point in the late Republic, orchestras in theatres and odea began to be enclosed for animal hunts (*venationes*) and for single pairs of gladiators: 600 beasts from Africa were killed at the inauguration of the Theatre of Marcellus on 7th May 11 BC. An inscription from Phaselis²¹ indicates *taurobolia* and *tuaromachia* in the orchestra from perhaps as early as the first-quarter of

18 Cf., especially Jory (1995).

19 Sear (2006: 273). Suetonius, *Life of Nero* 11.2, mentions that Nero included sparsiones and missiles at plays he gave.

20 The other two mention *ludi cum missilibus* (*CIL* 8.6996; 8.7960) which could mean plays but *ludi* is the generic noun for “entertainment” to which an adjective of specification is normally added.

This practice is very much like modern baseball games and hockey games where tee-shirts are fired into the crowd between innings or periods. *Missiles* would presume that they were scattered into the *summa cavea*, which Seneca, *Moral Essay* 9.11.8, dismissed as the ‘peanut gallery’.

21 Sear (2006: 373).

the first century BC.²² The conversion of the orchestra to an arena at Thasos belongs to the first century BC.²³ The conversion at Dodona is Augustan; bones of bulls and boars were found by the excavators in the orchestra. A Trajanic-Hadrianic date is often assigned for conversion of orchestras into arenas: although best known is the Theatre of Dionysus at Athens,²⁴ perhaps the best examples of orchestral conversions into arenas are the Rue Monge theatre in Paris,²⁵ the Claudian/Neronian theatre at Aphrodisias,²⁶ and the theatre from Italica, Trajan's home town.²⁷ The theatre at Tauromenium in Sicily is Trajanic-Hadrianic,²⁸ and an inscription in the theatre at Erythrac, Turkey, records the conversion of the orchestra into an arena in preparation for a visit by Hadrian.²⁹ Some theatres in Britain may have had arenas as part of the original design;³⁰ that at Derwentum belongs to the end of the first century BC, pre-dating the Claudian invasion of the island. Aquitania is, not surprisingly, early Flavian since Vespasian had his first legionary command in Britain under Claudius and as emperor Vespasian spent lavishly on the island. Few conversions of orchestras into arenas are later than mid-third century, partially because of financial

-
- 22 Duncan (2006: 200) is willing to countenance the possibility that a bull was actually sacrificed on stage in performance of Seneca's *Oedipus*. The problem with citation of Fitch (2000: 9–11) as her authority is that Fitch believes the Manto scene is one that would have been given in recited performance in salons, but removed in performance on stage. Her point remains valid that what could be “staged” in the orchestra as a preface to a play would resonate on staging of the play itself.
- 23 Significantly, some theatres, and at least one as close to Rome as Pompeii, had started the process of conversion before the publication of Vitruvius' *On Architecture*, dated generally to the period 27–24 BC. His remarks on the design of Roman theatres (5.6) should be taken as his generic proposal for a solid construction with aesthetics and acoustics rather than as an observation of the norm at the time of his writing.
- 24 The sequence of original construction, late Classical repair, Hellenistic repair, and Neronian renovation is well known. Other Roman phases are not well reported: conversion of the orchestra to an arena may be later and further renovation into a *kolymbethra* belongs to some time after the fifth century AD.
- 25 Sear (2006: 237–38).
- 26 Erim and Smith (1991).
- 27 Rodríguez (2001).
- 28 Sear (2006: 193).
- 29 Sear (2006: 336).
- 30 Most detailed in what can be recovered is the theatre at Heraclea Lyncestis in the Republic of Macedonia, unfortunately not securely dated (Sear 2006: 414). The post-earthquake reconstruction at Stobi (Gebhard 1975), for which many details remain, did not include a stage; rather, acting was done in the arena/orchestra.

crisis in the Empire,³¹ but also because of skyrocketing cost of blood sacrifice and blood sport.³² The imperial treasury collected a fee of 18–50 *aurei* for a gladiator, making it much more cost effective not to have them fight to the death (*munus sine missione*). A special licence was required from the emperor³³ as part of the fee; outside Italy, sharpened weapons were rarely allowed.³⁴ gladiatorial combat seemed less a *munus* than a staged *ludus*.³⁵ At 6 *aurei* each, condemned criminals were a bargain.

Although one must use caution in extrapolating from mosaics, those in the orchestra at Bulla Regia in Tunisia might indicate bear-baiting took place in that space.³⁶ The same might be said of the frieze blocks at Aezani in Turkey that show animals being hunted,³⁷ and the famous frieze of *erotes* hunting tigers at Miletus. Other than beast hunts and gladiatorial pairs, an early-Augustan inscription in the theatre at Barcelona (*CIL* 2.4514) indicates boxers in the orchestra, while statues of boxers flank the sides of the stage just above the orchestra at Aphrodisias, dating to the period of its conversion.³⁸ Inscriptions in the theatre at Ephesus that survive indicate no fewer than 31 pairs of gladiators plus animals from Africa.³⁹

Conversion into *kolymbethra* (water pools) is often linked to the decline of popularity of gladiatorial combat and animal sacrifice and so most conversions are placed at the end of the third century or later.⁴⁰ The theatre at Ephesus, however, is one of very few that clearly shows a progression from

31 For which, cf., Harrison in J. Francis and A. Kouremenos, *Crete in the Roman Empire* (2015).

32 Late conversions tend to be for *venationes* and executions *ad bestias*, which remained popular.

END OF SECOND CENTURY: Side (Sear 2006: 377).

THIRD CENTURY: Myra (Sear 2006: 370); Perge (Sear 2006: 372); Curium (Cyprus; Sear 2006: 381); Corinth, theatre (Sear 2006: 392); Corinth, *odeum* (225 AD; Sear 2006: 393).

On the comparative cost of gladiators vs. condemned, cf. Harrison (2015) in Francis and Kouremenos.

33 Duncan (2006: 204).

34 τοῖς ἀξέσιν; cf., Tataki (2009: 640) and also Potter (2004: 76–77).

35 Uncharitable comparisons with contemporary professional wrestling and tennis exhibition matches come to mind but are not without applicability.

36 Sear (2006: 276).

37 Bernardi Ferrero (1974: 177–80).

38 Erim and Smith (1991: 84–86).

39 Sear (2006: 334).

40 THIRD CENTURY: Ephesus (Sear 2006: 334); Salamis (Cyprus; Sear 2006: 383).

FOURTH CENTURY: Caesarea (Israel; Sear 2006: 303); Troy, *odeum* (Sear 2006: 357; doubted by Rose); Argos, large theatre (Sear 2006: 386); Corinth, theatre (Sear 2006: 392).

orchestra (66 AD) to arena (early third century AD) to *kolymbethrum* (late third century AD),⁴¹ and few can be as precisely dated as Pamukkale in Turkey.⁴² Earlier conversions can be attested: the conversion of the large theatre at Pompeii is dated to the time of the Sullan veterans' colony (80 BC). Additionally, the *odeum* at Gortyn was converted possibly as early as the reign of Claudius and certainly by the time of the repairs undertaken by Trajan, who had served there as *quaestor*.⁴³ There is a similar range of dates (Claudian to Hadrianic) for the theatre at Baiae,⁴⁴ while the conversion at Nemi can be firmly dated to the Julio-Claudian period.⁴⁵ The conversion at Catana in Sicily cannot be later than the reign of Hadrian.⁴⁶

The pools were normally shallow enough that people could stand in waist-deep water: the one at Argos, for example, was only 1.10 m. deep. They also seem to have been put to different uses: the *kolymbethrum* at Baiae seems to have been used for fish-breeding, and so would have been merely ornamental, and presented itself as a prohibitive barrier between the audience and the stage, thereby hampering metatheatrical exchange between actors and audience, and perhaps also between audience and actors.⁴⁷ Vatinius, for example,

FIFTH CENTURY: Syracuse Greek Theatre (Sear 2006: 191); Cyrene (according to Stucchi); Ptolemais (Libya; Sear 2006: 293).

NO DATE: Iasus/Iassus (Turkey; Sear 2006: 339); Nysa (Turkey; Sear 2006: 345); Tralles (Turkey; Sear 2006: 355).

UNCERTAIN: Magnesia ad Maeandrum (Turkey) of which Ferrero wrote: "Arena: diameter c. 22.5 m; orchestra turned into arena in Roman times by suppressing front row of seats; could be flooded or used for gladiatorial games." This would make it appear that its second-century redesign was as a *kolymbethra* but that when drained it could be used as an arena.

- 41 The original construction of the acropolis theatre at Pergamum is Hellenistic. The two Roman phases cannot be precisely dated but the first removed the three lowest seats to make an arena, and later the parodos doors were closed to turn it into a *kolymbethra*.

The process is compressed in Myra (Demre, Turkey): constructed in the early third century AD, the orchestra was converted into an arena in the late third century AD, and to a *kolymbethra* within decades (Sear 2006: 370).

- 42 Kolb (1974: 255–70).

- 43 DiVita (2010: 102–19).

- 44 De Angelis d'Ossat (1977).

- 45 Some cannot be dated with precision: cf., Sear (2006: 177) for Montegrotto Terme.

- 46 Sear (2006: 186).

- 47 Although Duncan (2006: 193) focuses on the Empire as a time when the theatre was one of the few places left where the people could make their opinions known by re-acting to real or imagined contemporary references in plays, the phenomenon already had a rich history in the Republic. Bell (2006: 175) writes that P. Lentulus Spinther presented

tried to pass a law restricting objects thrown at actors and impresarios (he was the latter in a gladiatorial *munus*) to pieces of fruit after he had been pelted with stones.⁴⁸ On another occasion and another place an actor was lynched by the audience over political interpolations, and another actor in a different play barely escaped with his life.⁴⁹ The orchestra at Baiae, in addition to fish breeding, possibly also had an ornamental fountain (*nymphaeum*), which was perhaps used as a mister of perfumed water (*sparsio*); the pool at Bauli was definitely used as a *nymphaeum*.⁵⁰ The *kolymbethrum* at Nemi was decidedly used for water ballet.⁵¹ The modification of the arena into a *kolymbethrum* in the large theatre at Pompeii has not been determined satisfactorily: it could have been a *nymphaeum*, or a mister, although both together are not impossible. The excavator of Daphnae in Turkey, as reported by Traversari,⁵² thought that the theatre, constructed at the end of first century AD was converted into a *kolymbethrum* which was then used for single boat combats (*naumachia*).

Conversion to a *kolymbethrum* does not automatically mean that the space was used exclusively for aquatic spectacles from that moment: an inscription from the *odeum* at Gortyn indicates that the orchestra continued to be used for *venationes* into the sixth century, so apparently the *kolymbethrum* could be emptied and re-filled efficiently.⁵³ In an article on aquatic displays, which centres itself on the opening 100 days of the Flavian amphitheatre, Coleman⁵⁴ nevertheless notes that Nero had his wooden amphitheatre flooded in AD 57 for a *naumachia*. Dio (61.9.5), however, called this *stagnum* a “theatre”, and included the detail that the pool was filled with sea creatures, both mammals and fish. It raises the possibility that a flooded orchestra could have a single combat between two skiffs and that, in light of the hunting of hippopotami and seals reported by Calpurnius Siculus (7.65–68) it is not improbable that a *venatio* in a *kolymbethrum* could be marine animals. Pools in the orchestra could open up

L. Afranius' *Simulans* in 56 BC having it performed to highlight contemporary politics. Such is a given for historical dramas (*fabulae praetextae*), so Erasmo (2004) and Manuwald (2010) plus Cowan and Ginsberg in this volume. Asking after demonstrations in plays is a recurring topic in Cicero's correspondence with Atticus. Physical separation of performers from audience could not but have had a dampening effect on interchange.

48 Parker (1999: 168). The reference to “actors” means that the gladiatorial combat in question must have happened in a theatre.

49 Rawson (1985: 98).

50 Sear (2006: 120). *Nymphaeae*, however, more likely were placed exterior to the theatre.

51 Sear (2006: 128).

52 Traversari (1960: 23–27).

53 A. Maiuri (1911: 9).

54 Coleman (1993: 56–57).

opportunities for producers of such entertainments: Coleman⁵⁵ cites Martial, *LS* 25, for a mime/execution on the myth of Hero and Leander, a favourite among actors according to Fronto, and one can easily see it performed in a *kolymbethrum*. So, too, it has been suggested that the closing to Seneca's *Trojan Women* and that Roman revivals of Euripides' *Cyclops* could have exploited a flooded pool so that the chorus of Trojan women and the crew of Odysseus, respectively, might exit by boarding boats in the orchestra.⁵⁶ Such would be possible even if on dry land but more "spectacular" if the orchestra was flooded.

2 The Semiotics of Seating

Early conversions of the orchestra for non-choral activity raises questions, as well, about seating arrangements. Livy for 194 BC (34.44.5 and 34.54.4–8) is the witness that the censors segregated an area for senators in the theatre at Rome. There is reason to believe that at this early time all spectators stood, and so the passage would imply that the lowest part of the scaffolding was reserved for senators.⁵⁷ Vitruvius' statement (5.6.2) that senators were seated in the orchestra thereby moving the chorus to the stage would apply only to Rome which was the only place that had officials titled *senatores*.⁵⁸

55 Coleman (1993: 62–63).

56 Harrison (2000) for Seneca and Harrison (2005) for Euripides. If it is not possible to prove that opportunities for use in plays followed conversion, decorative schemes sometimes did. At Ostia, for example, conversion to *kolymbethrum* was accompanied by installation of statues of Marine Venus.

57 A new interpretation would allow the possibility that opinion against permanent constructions, already known at that time in other cities in Italy, was against the *luxuria* of the audience sitting and not necessarily restricted to opinion hostile to the acting profession—a similar condemnation greeted the first awnings over theatres in Rome in 69 BC (Valerius Maximus 2.4.6: *Campanam imitatus luxuriam*). Seen in this light, the Bacchanal scandals of 186 BC presented an opportunity in the service of political factionalism to try to supplant non-native performance traditions with the more manly (i.e. Roman) animal hunts and beast baiting, first displayed at Rome in that year by M. Fulvius Nobilior in his triumphal games (cf. n. 7 above). Political factionalism seems the likely motivating force in Scipio waiting three years until a permanent theatre of his political rivals, C. Cassius Longinus and M. Valerius Messalla, was nearly complete before moving a bill in 151 BC for its destruction. If his opposition was moral, his re-action should have been immediate.

58 As the orchestra was no longer needed for choral dance, this would explain why the Vitruvian model for the orchestra was a half circle as opposed to the full circle of the Greek theatre; the altar of the Greek orchestra would have had to be moved on stage. Cf.,

Cicero also placed senators in the orchestra, with *equites* in the 14 lower rows of seats (*ima cavea*) and plebs in the upper seating (*summa cavea*) above the *praecinctio*.⁵⁹ It made perfect sense for Cicero that in demonstrations in the theatre one should be able to tell which *ordo* was responsible for the ruckus. Parker, who discussed this, and other passages, in Cicero in detail, accompanied his article with photographs of the large theatre and *odeum* at Pompeii that have four wide rows of seats with a low rise.⁶⁰ Significantly, they are at the *edge* of the orchestra to accommodate stone *bisellia* and not portable chairs that could be put *in* the orchestra.⁶¹ In such a configuration the *editor* (sponsor of the festivities) would sit on the tribunal for all to see except the *senatores*, at least some of whom would have been, or could have been, *editores* at past or future *ludi*. The tribunal looming above the orchestra would have been visible to the *plebs* and *equites* watching the festivities and each other. The most

Damon (1997) on Livy and Sear (1990, answering Small 1983) on Vitruvius with discussion by Bell (2006: 178–79).

Problems that scholars have perceived with choral presence and absence in Seneca and what a chorus does not know that it should reasonably know should be tied to the problems of placing a chorus on stage rather than in the orchestra; cf. esp. Hill (2000: 565, 571, 576) and Harrison (2011).

- 59 Care needs to be taken to assess the credibility of Cicero, *Pro Sestio* 16, an oration on behalf of a (guilty) client. Similarly in several of his letters, Cicero wallows in *Schadenfreude* over slights to his enemies or gloating at his own success.

Ancient theatre has long been subject to hostile sources: Libanius (314–393 AD) announced the end of tragedy in the teeth of the evidence. So, too, the Temple to Venus Victrix in the Theatre of Pompey is cited as a sop to traditional religious sentiment, yet the Temple was not completed until three years after the theatre opened: Pompey does not seem to have been very concerned about adverse publicity over religious strictures. This does not deny that religious ritual did not occur in theatres: Sear (2006: 207) places a cult of initiation in the Altbachtal Theatre at Augusta Treverorum, and initiation is certain in the Temple to Cybele that is part of the theatre at Vienne (Sear 2006: 254). There is a frieze of a naked man holding a torch, another naked man carrying a ram, and a third scene (damaged) with Cybele.

- 60 Parker (1999).

- 61 Portable chairs in the orchestra are known, but generally for music concerts, which were most often held in *odea* or in *bouleuteria* often rented out for other events; cf. Izenour (1992) and the *bouleuteria* at Nysa (Sear 2006: 346), Troy (Sear 2006: 357), and Arylicanda (Sear 2006: 365). The *odeum* at Cosa would have had a small capacity and the statues of Agrippina—Nero—[divus] Claudius set at the back of narrow niches seem more parallel to the dining room of the *vigiles* at Ostia or the Roman *bouleuterion* at Aptera (Crete, personal observation); for the Cosa structure, cf., Collins-Clinton (2000).

Odea could be restricted to just concerts, such as the *odeum* in the heroön of Diodorus Paspurus at Pergamum which had a capacity of about 170 (Sear 2006: 347).

notorious such production occurred in Cadiz where the Roman governor wrote and produced a historical drama about a secret diplomatic mission between Pompey and Caesar of which he, Cornelius Balbus, made himself the principal figure. A letter to Cicero relates with glee how the audience fastened its gaze on Balbus in the audience overcome with emotion over Balbus on stage.⁶² The sight lines of the presiding official on the tribunal, and seating, at least in Rome, of groups by social class and influence are very suggestive of the sight lines that Clarke has argued for and also Beacham.⁶³ For Beacham, the *dominus* “staged-managed” the decoration in the public and semi-public rooms of his house in a progression of admission and revelation not unlike the entry to the theatre. For theatres that were modified for fighting or for aquatic spectacles, the *aditi maximi* (main ground level entrances) became unavailable to officials of spectacles and honoured guests but were used by the competitors. Until then, the *senatores* in Rome, and ranking officials elsewhere had the “grandest entrance” available to them.

Few theatres outside of Italy have reserved rows for high backed broad stone chairs (*bisellia*).⁶⁴ Where the inscriptional evidence is plentiful, provincial theatres do not have the same organising principles as Cicero claimed for Rome. Local elites (*decuriones*) still would have monopolised the lower seating, and most often theatres had a tribunal on the audience left for the presiding official, but evidence suggests that sometimes individuals or families were able to buy seats, as at Stobi and Termessus where names were inscribed on the stone.⁶⁵ Wedges (*cuneus*, Greek *kerkis*) partitioned off by the *praecinatio*, orchestra/*porticus* above and below, and stairs on the sides seem to have been controlled by *collegia*, or other groups. At Bostra in Syria, for example, inscriptions have been discovered reserving sections for Χαλκατόποι[ων] (copper beaters), Ἀσκοποίων (wine skin makers), and Χρυσοχόων (jewellers). Groups that had reserved seating areas, apparently, could put up statues enforcing ownership. In Athens, where the *cunei* were allotted by tribe, each tribe put up in its wedge

62 As his historical drama, *Iter*, was performed the year after the assassination of Caesar, it placed him firmly on the fence politically in a province that still had strong pro-Pompeian sympathies and Caesarian veterans' colonies.

63 Clarke (1991) and more recently Beacham (2013).

64 Statistics would not be informative because of the state of the evidence but, when it is possible to assess, only 18 theatres outside of Rome were constructed with broad, low floors for special seating. Almost all were Roman governmental centres, Roman veterans' colonies, or forward areas for the Roman army.

65 Small (1987: 88–93).

a statue of Hadrian in honour of his visit in 126 AD;⁶⁶ tribal allocation of seating is also attested at Troy, theatre A.⁶⁷

What the theatre came to be used for more than anything else was celebration of the imperial cult, and so the names of former masters and manumitted slaves carved on the lowest three rows of seats at Oeniadae, Greece, is decisive since priests of the imperial cult had to be freedmen.⁶⁸ These celebrations, usually for the emperor's birthday and the anniversary of his accession, most often took place in a theatre: *Suetonius, Life of Nero* 11–12, firmly links production of plays with promotion of the imperial cult. Gebhard⁶⁹ has presented a synopsis of an inscription left by the freedman, Gaius Julius Eurycles and his son Gaius Julius Lacon, who sponsored a celebration during the reign of Tiberius at Stobi: a statue of the emperor, seated as if a god, was led in procession and placed on the tribunal, or in the middle of the theatre where his epiphany at a festival in his honour was implicit.⁷⁰ Recording of equipment they paid for makes it certain that there were mimes and tragedies. Theirs was a modest show by standards known elsewhere, but freedmen everywhere were eager to commemorate their loyalty and largesse:⁷¹ statues of Phalacreus and his wife adorned the scene building at Segesta.⁷² At Calama in Tunisia,⁷³ an inscription records that the *boulé* set up five statues in gratitude to Aelia Restituta, and another that Anna Aelia Restituta, Flaminica Augustorum, spent HS 400.000 to build the theatre. At Sagalassus in front of the stage building an inscription by the *collegium* of dyers honours Q. Philippianus Varus, high priest of Augustus, for gladiatorial games and beast hunts lasting four days.⁷⁴

66 Small (1987: 87).

67 Sear (2006: 356). Even with the allotment of sections, tickets corresponding to seats were still necessary and have been found in the Zea theatre at Piraeus (Sear 2006: 404) and Heraclea Lyncestis, Republic of Macedonia (Sear 2006: 414).

68 Sear (2006: 414).

69 Gebhard (1988: 65).

70 Seated statues of Augustus, Livia, and Tiberius were placed in the lowest seats in the theatre at Gytheion (Sturgeon 2000: 67). This is similar to Roman funeral ritual in which a mime dressed as the deceased, imitating his well-known mannerisms, attended events that were part of the funeral, including the theatre.

71 In most cities a freedman was barred from office and so could not gain Roman citizenship; holding the office of priest of the imperial cult conferred citizenship and made one eligible for civic office (*decurio*).

72 Sear (2006: 190).

73 Sear (2006: 276).

74 Sear (2006: 374).

3 Heterogeneous Glyptics Recommending Homogenous Reception of Tragedy

What is surprisingly rare are statues or reliefs that can be tied convincingly to actors or to a specific known play. The Villa of Domitian with its theatre at Albanum had nine panels, five of which survive: Dionysus and three of the Muses (Melpomene, Terpsichore, and Thalia), who are joined by Medea, which can only be a reference to a tragedy. Inscribed bases survive from the theatre at Tusculum (c. 100 BC) of Telemachus, Telegonus, Orestes, and the poet Diphilus; the first three can be linked to tragedies while Diphilus was an important comic poet.⁷⁵ The Niobid group from Tauromenium was probably on the *scaenae frons*, indicating a tragedy on her myth.⁷⁶ The *collegium* of victorious artists at Apamea, Syria, dedicated a statue to P. Aulus Crispus, an actor of tragedy and mime.⁷⁷ The *collegium* of the parasites of Dionysus also at Apamea similarly honoured Julius Paris, a pantomime.⁷⁸ Strabo (14.1.23) reports a bronze statue of the citharoide Anaxenor at Magnesia ad Menandrum.

It is unexpected that there are not many statues of Hercules in theatres.⁷⁹ Several emperors identified themselves with him, he was a deity in his own right, he was the main or subsidiary figure in many Greek and Latin tragedies comedies, satyr dramas, mimes, farces, and pantomimes. On at least two occasions, criminals were executed by placing them on a pyre and burning them.⁸⁰ It is tempting to want to associate such executions with performances of the *Hercules Oetaeus* or *Trachiniae*, either as the culmination of the play itself, or

75 The almost total lack of inscriptions, reliefs, and sculptures in theatres relevant to comedy, apart from generic comic masks might be taken to indicate a decline of comedy in general, except that there is a dearth in theatres of art indicating any kind of performance. On the death of comedy, cf., Duncan (2006: 190–91) and Wilson (2007: 257–87).

76 The location (Sear 2006: 193) is not secure but their tumble into the area would point to the *scaenae frons* as would the colossal head of Augustus (appropriate for above the central door), Aphrodite, Artemis, and some Roman magistrates.

77 Sear (2006: 317).

78 Rey-Coquais (1973: 47–48).

79 The catalogue in Sears cites only Hercules with infant Telephus (Theatre of Pompey, Rome), on the *scaenae frons* at Minturnae, in the semi-circular aedicule of the *proscenium* of the South Theatre at Hadrian's villa, near the scene building at Lupiae, unknown location at Catana of both a statue and Hercules fighting giants on a frieze, a statue at Rusicada, a statue found in the orchestra at Carthage, herm at the end of the *proscenium* at Leptis Magna, between the niches in the *proscenium* at Sabratha.

80 Duncan (2006: 201–202).

on the same occasion, either in the theatre or other nearby venue.⁸¹ It is a given of Senecan scholarship that violence in his plays reflects contemporary society. A pantomime in the time of Augustus of the *Hercules furens* was famous for the actor shooting arrows into the audience.⁸² Violence in the orchestra before the play might have, for example, intensified the emotion of a production of Seneca's *Hercules furens* on stage. Seneca's nod to popular tastes is not just a strong indication that his plays were in performance but equally that theatre in the Empire retained mass appeal.

Galba established games in honour of Hercules,⁸³ who was perceived as the patron of athletic competitions.⁸⁴ Although the number of statues of Hercules in theatres is small, about half that have been reported were part of the wall at the back of the orchestra (*proscenium*) that supported the stage. Because this is the area where gladiators would have fought, the number and placement is significant and there is a positive correlation between Hercules statues in the *proscenium* and theatres modified for combat. The *proscenium* wall was a straight line into which alternate curvilinear and rectilinear niches were cut. At Sabratha most suggestively,⁸⁵ the rectilinear niches had scenes of comedy, tragedy and mime, Roma, and diva Sabratha; the curvilinear niches had a Muse, satyr, the three Graces, and the Judgement of Paris; in the flat area, i.e. jutting into the orchestra itself, were statues of Nike—Mercury—Hercules—Apollo—Dionysos—Nemesis. Twenty-three statues were found in the orchestra of the theatre at Carthage:⁸⁶ although it is possible that they fell from the *scaenae frons*, placement of the four naked statues of athletes would seem more appropriate on the orchestra parapet.

Nike⁸⁷ indicates victory and is associated with victory in the dramatic festivals at Athens, and elsewhere. As goddess of victory, she is also a symbol

81 The Hercules Cornucopia type, representing the horn of Acheloös, with whom he wrestled for Deianira, would be appropriate for placement in theatres. Unfortunately none of the examples in Becatti (1968) have theatre find spots.

82 Cf. Duncan (2006) for pantomime (195) and for Seneca's tragedy (199–201).

83 Wiseman (2000). Wiseman would associate the inaugural games of Hercules with the first performance of the *Octavia*.

84 Other associations of Hercules have local importance: at Corinth, for example, Hercules was revered as patron of merchants. Reliefs of Hercules filled the space between the columns on the *scaenae frons* on the two upper levels, flanking statues of Augustus, Livia and Hadrian. A statue of Hercules joins the gallery of deities on the first level (Sturgeon 2000: 68–72).

85 Sear (2006: 283).

86 Sear (2006: 277). Sometimes such statues were used as stanchions for netting.

87 Two annual festivals at Rome were dedicated to Nike—the Victory games of Sulla and the Victory games of Caesar; cf., Hölscher (2004: 60–62) especially on how the Aphrodite of

par excellence of the emperor whose statues and other symbols were ever-present in theatres. There was also the tradition that amphitheatres had two gates, one by which the victorious gladiator left (the Victory gate) and the other by which the defeated gladiator left (the Nemesis gate). Find spots of Nike and Nemesis statues are too little recorded, and too few survive to be statistically significant, but the few indications are tantalising that Nike statues may tend to cluster towards the audience left, that is, the Victory gate. The clearest evidence comes from Aphrodisias⁸⁸ where the three pairs of Nike statues adorned different parts of the structure but all on the left side of the theatre.⁸⁹ The sets are further distinguished by attributes: one pair with a palm, which might seem to be literary, one pair with a trophy, which might suggest combat, and the third pair stepping on a globe, usually symbolic of the invincibility of the emperor.⁹⁰

Duncan⁹¹ has observed that since gladiators fought with dulled weapons and as types in armour that was tantamount to costumes, gladiatorial combat must have seemed “staged” to the audience and that the gladiators played stereotypical roles such as in new comedy. For reasons of imperial propaganda, at certain times one kind of gladiator had to win, just as the “right side” had to prevail in historical re-enactments in the amphitheatre or *naumachia* rendering gladiatorial combat as scripted or predictable as a play of Menander or Terence.⁹² The theatricality of posed combat would have offered a seamless transition to the play on stage after the combat. In the event of a beast hunt, the beast was predestined to die, and in front of which *proscenium* statue or relief the animal expired could have become part of the reception of the spectacle in the theatre.⁹³ A series of graffiti from inside the stage building at Ephesus

Capua type was appropriated so that Nike inscribes the name of the victor on the shield thereby associating Victory with Venus and the Julii.

88 Erim and Smith (1991: 74–78).

89 It is significant that in Aristophanes, Blepyrus in triumph exits off stage to the left, that is, towards the street of Tripods; cf. Wilson (2007: 284–85). Nike statues are known from theatres at Falerio Picenus, Arausio, Sabratha, Ephesus, Kırklareli (Turkey), and Philippi. The correlation between Nike statues and evidence of conversion to arenas is not as strong as one would like.

90 Such an interpretation parallels the statues of Dionysus, Apollo, and Hercules added to the theatre at Carthage in honour of the establishment of Pythian Games and symbolising plays, musical events, and athletic competitions (Sturgeon 2000: 67).

91 Duncan (2006: 266–71).

92 Duncan (2006: 291).

93 Sturgeon (2000: 71).

seem to be scrawls by actors on how to block scenes.⁹⁴ Comic figures, such as a fisherman with an erection, predominate, and at least one fragment may be from a tragedy with Peleus, Thetis, and Hercules named, but several could in fact be gladiators, based on costume, with mythological *noms de guerre*.

4 A Forest of Statues

It is said of the archaic temple to Artemis at Ephesus that it was “a forest of columns”. The temporary Theatre of Scaurus in 58 BC was already notorious for its 3000 bronze statues. The experience of the theatre for Romans in the Empire must have been similar to a forest of statues, many of which centered on the emperor and his family. The message would have started even as the Roman was going into the theatre, like the *cliens* visiting his *patronus* in Beacham,⁹⁵ with the queue at the *vomitorium*, that is, the long entry tunnels, and anular passages. Taking his seat, the spectator would be impressed by the frescoes painted on the *post scaenam*, the façade at the back of the stage. The Theatre of Pompey, for example, had (most famously) Polygnotus’ “man with a shield”, Antiphilus’ “Cadmus and Europa”, Pausias’ “Sacrifice of Oxen” and Nicias the Younger’s “Alexander”. If not in Rome, a *post scaenium*, possibly as high as three storeys, might have statues of Tiberius, Britannicus, Messalina, Drusus the Elder, and in their midst a seated Claudius as at Caere.⁹⁶

Grandeas enter via the *aditus maximus*, unless the orchestra was closed off,⁹⁷ whose vaults at Nuceria had 3rd style frescoes as well as a portrait head

94 Roueché (2002: 256–73).

95 Beacham (2013).

96 *Post scaenam*: Arausio (Sear 2006: 245) had 4 friezes of Centaurs and an Amazonomachy, both taken as signs of imperial military success, re-inforced by the victories; additionally there were scenes from the life of Dionysus. Cf., Erim and Smith (1991: 90–97).

Post scaenam sometimes includes the two rooms at the side the stage, which, depending on the orientation of the entrance could be used as prop rooms (Sear 2006: 328 for Aphrodisias) or were private dining rooms (Aptera, Crete; personal observation).

97 Closing off of orchestras for gladiators, *venationes* or *kolymbethra* would explain why choral entrances and exits were normally through the audience in the Roman Empire and why once the chorus was on stage, it tended to remain on stage, pretending an obliviousness as dramatically necessary. Choral entrance through the audience might, I think, have had the effect of identifying the audience with the chorus’ point of view more strongly than can be asserted for Attic tragedy.

of Nero's mother, Agrippina, and a statue of Athena.⁹⁸ The annular passage and the *vomitorium* (covered passage to *praecinctio*) for less distinguished citizens had stucco reliefs and painted stucco, such as in Domitian's theatre on his estate at Albanum.

Arriving at one's seats meant weighing how greatly the view was obstructed by statues, some gilded, marking the sections of *collegia* and tribes. If the orchestra had been converted for beast hunts or gladiators, it would have been populated with statues of gods, emperors and athletes, plus anchoring nets above the balustrade, all of which would have obscured the view, but competed for the audience's attention. The imperial cult, at least at some locations, seems to have dominated the portico on top of the cavea, occasionally interspersed with small temples. At Herculaneum, for example, there is known to have been a life-size bronze statue of Tiberius as a citizen in a toga, emphasizing theatre attendance as a civic past time negotiated between the emperor and his people. Between two other columns there was a statue of his mother, Livia, as well as a togate statue of M. Calatorius and L. Mammius Maximus, rich freedmen who had been priests of the cult of Roma et Augustus during the reign of Claudius.⁹⁹

The curved part of the orchestra closest to the seats would have been invisible but the *proscenium* wall would have been the lowest of at least four registers advertising imperial majesty and devotion due to the gods. In a theatre, like that at Faesulae, the niches would have had statues of the imperial family interspersed with reliefs showing a Dionysiac procession. Crouching Sileni

98 *Aditus maximus* and *analemmata*: statues of Telamones (giants as columns) were popular, such as at the odeum at Pompeii (Sear 2006: 132), Falerio Picenus (Sear 2006: 156), and possible Aquileia Venetiae (Sear 2006: 175). A maenad and a satyr function as Telamones at Iaitas, Sicily (Sear 2006: 188).

Analemmata as major supporting walls are prime repositories of inscriptions: in an inscription to Domitian, the people of Ephesus recorded that they built the theatre at their own expense. This is significant since in a famous exchange between Pliny and Trajan (*Epistles* 10.39), Pliny requests more funds since the theatre at Nicea has cost 10,000,000 HS so far and is already cracking. Trajan's testy response is that all Greeks care about is theatres and *stadia*. Compare this to the theatre at Calama, Tunisia, which Anna Aelia Restituta built privately for 400,000 HS.

99 *Porticus*: A head of Augustus from Volaterra (Sear 2006: 170). Temples are still constructed at the top of the *cavea* at least to the end of the first century AD, such as at Amman, Jordan, with an Athena in the Myron type, a headless cuirassed emperor and a draped Faustina the Younger. At Stratonicea, Turkey, the temple at the top of the *cavea* appears to have been dedicated to the imperial cult (Sear 2006: 354).

were favoured in the end niches in places such as the Theatre of Dionysus at Athens and at Verona; Pan substituted at Segesta. Vienne's *proscenium* shows the enthusiasm of its citizens for *venationes*: there were two sets of four lions confronting each other, satyrs' heads on top of plinths, two hounds, three bulls, stallions, a procession of ibexes, and Orpheus charming animals. Roman law allowed gambling on days on the Roman calendar marked as *F(estiva)*. Given: given what is known of Romans, it is not unlikely that members of the audience might have made wagers by which statue in the *proscenium* animals would die. Taste at Sabratha was more sedate: there were personifications of Rome and Sabratha, pouring a libation, a bull sacrifice, a scene from comedy, a scene from tragedy, three Muses, a satyr, three Graces and the Judgement of Paris.

On top of the *proscenium* at the very front of the *pulpitum* (stage) would have been sleeping satyrs, such as at Caere, Lisbon, and Sparta.¹⁰⁰ At Vienne the Sileni sleep with urns, emptied of wine, as pillows. They had the functional use of hiding the curtain (*aulaeum*) once it was dropped to begin the performance. Holes for the up-rights for the stage curtain remain visible at Leptis Magna, Italica,¹⁰¹ and elsewhere.

The interacting figures of reliefs were particularly impressed into imperial service, and scenes of Amazonomachy and Gigantomachy, especially, were equated with victory of the emperor.¹⁰² Reliefs would have been carved on the various tunnels going to seating and the *proscenium*, but most especially the flat frontal surface of the *podia* supporting the columns on the *scenae frons* itself. The Theatre of Balbus at Rome had a Gigantomachy as did Catana in Sicily which also had a procession frieze linking visually the imperial family and defeat of chaos. Sometimes the reliefs, as at Perge, had scenes from the myth of Dionysus.

The *scenae frons* was an imposing sculpture gallery. The upper level, the level of the gods by the convention of Greek drama, would have been reserved for deities, but also for members of the imperial family. Facial features of the imperial family would have been massaged so that they resembled each other

¹⁰⁰ Ajootian (1993).

¹⁰¹ Rodríguez (2001: 244).

¹⁰² de Bellefonds (1996: 174). For a far more nuanced read of Roman sculptural programs than is possible here, cf., Edwards (2003). Stewart (2008: 151 with fig. 36) illustrates an Amazonomachy from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias in which a portrait of Claudius is instantly recognizable killing an Amazon.

perhaps more closely than genetics warranted.¹⁰³ The levels of the *scaenae frons* above ground level would have imposed themselves by their presence and impressiveness as part of the backdrop to the play—a painted canvas set would not have reached high enough to cover them. The gods and members of the imperial family would have inserted themselves into the play as *mutae personae*, their epiphany in stone, similar to the Victorian and Edwardian vogue for statues, or naked women posing as statues, on the stage (*tableaux vivants*).¹⁰⁴ They would have given their approval to the proceedings and with the emperor visible everywhere in the theatre, his majesty would have been the ambience that coloured all else that took place. Aygon¹⁰⁵ has described Seneca as a *pictor in fabula*; when assessing the visual narrative of Seneca, both how he presents it and how he inferred the audience might receive it, the canvas on which he painted had the watermark of imperial and divine *imagines*. When Seneca has Atreus chortle (*Thyestes* 265–266)

Fiat hoc, fiat nefas
quod, di, timetis

Let this happen, this sacrilege
that you, gods, fear.

he has Atreus address the gods in the vocative. It is attractive to think that the actor on stage might have wagged his fingers at the statues of gods on the *scaena frons*.¹⁰⁶

This section is necessarily a partially false picture since it brings together in one setting the totality of visual possibilities for the theatre in the Roman Empire.¹⁰⁷ Not all theatres had converted orchestras, and porticoes on top of

103 Stewart (2008: 85). The practice (*Zeitgesicht*) is an old one used by Pompey to make himself appear the new Alexander, and by Cleopatra suggesting her closeness to Caesar, and by the partisans of Caesar as in the Cartoceto bronzes; cf. Harrison 2009.

104 Cf., esp., Macintosh (2013).

105 Aygon (2004).

106 A physical gesture at the *scaenae frons* is also implicit in lines 885–886 when Atreus claims he strides equal to the stars touching all the gods high in the sky.

107 Adjacent related structures, such as stand-alone scene buildings and *quadriportici* are ignored in this contribution, even though *quadriportici* often contained statues, altars, and other material related to the imperial cult.

Scene-buildings could also have significant decoration: the podium of the colonnade at Pamukkale, Turkey, had a sacrificial scene with Septimius Severus as Jupiter; Apollo and Artemis; Dionysiac scenes; and *imagines clipeatae* of Attalus and Eumenes (Sear

the *cavea* cannot be demonstrated for all. The picture that emerges, however, is one that stresses the richness in diversity of Roman theatre decoration and spatial organisation. It also puts tragedies on stage in an atmosphere that would have deeply guided and affected their reception, and makes clear that an important part of the theatre in a Roman theatre was the emperor-as-*histricus*¹⁰⁸ stage-managing the imperial cult, and through it loyalty, local aristocratic solidarity, and social cohesion.¹⁰⁹ Statues of the emperor and his family, even if possibly carved at Rome and certainly approved by the imperial household, were set up by town councils at imperial behest. Their presence, particularly in the very great number of statues that must have crowded a theatre, show that they got the message.¹¹⁰

2006: 338). This last prefigures the upper exterior façade of the Flavian amphitheatre at Rome and seems apparent in the medallion reliefs of Romulus and Remus at theatre A at Troy (Sear 2006: 356); cf., also Orchomenos (Sear 2006: 402).

108 For the *histricus* in Plautus, cf., Slater in this volume.

109 Stewart (2008: 105). For a parallel assessment of Athenian male social cohesion as integral to Attic drama, cf., Cowen in this volume 68–71 and Griffith (2005).

110 Thanks are owed to my research assistants Pietro Mastromateo, Daniel Ruderman, and George Sokrates Viron, and especially to Vayos Liapis and to Jane Francis who did thorough critiques of drafts of this paper. Fiona Macintosh's work on living statues in Victorian and Edwardian theatre (cf. note 104 as also references in Slaney's contribution to this volume) pointed me in the direction of assessing what would have been the ambient surroundings of performance that would have affected both performance itself and its reception.

The title is by way of compliment to the Marx Brothers' movie, "A Day at the Races" which focused entirely on all of the activity surrounding races and not on the horse race itself.

Bibliography

- Adams, J.N. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge.
- Ahl, F. 2008. *Two Faces of Oedipus*. Ithaca.
- Allan, W. & Kelly, A. 2013. "Listening to Many Voices: Athenian Tragedy as Popular Art", in A. Marmorodoro & J. Hill (eds.), *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity* (Oxford) 77–122.
- Allan, W. 2001. "Euripides in Megale Hellas: Some Aspects of the Early Reception of Tragedy", *G&R* 48: 67–86.
- Amoroso, F. 1981. "Annunzi e scene d'annunzio nel teatro di L. Anneo Seneca", *Dioniso* 52: 307–38.
- Andall, J. & Duncan, D. (eds.), 2010. *National Belongings: Hybridity in Italian Colonial and Postcolonial Cultures*. Bern.
- Andrews, N.E. 2004. "Re-Presentation and the Semantics of Space in Plautus' *Casina*", *Mnemosyne* 57: 445–64.
- Anliker, K. 1960. *Prologue und Akteinteilung in Senecas Tragödien*. Berne.
- Arcellaschi, A. 1990. *Médée dans le théâtre latin d'Ennius à Sénèque*. Rome.
- Argenio, R. 1961. "Retorica e politica nelle tragedie di Accio", *Rivista di Studi Classici* 9: 198–12.
- Arìcò, G. 1983. "L'Ars Poetica di Orazio e la tragedia romana arcaica", *QCTC*: 67–93.
- 1998. "...spirat tragicum (Horace, epist. 2, 1, 166). Réflexions sur le tragique romain archaïque", *Pallas* 49: 73–90.
- 1998. "Accio e la fine del teatro", in I. Lana & E.V. Maltese (eds.), *Storia della civiltà letteraria greca e latina*, 2: 402–14.
- 2004. "Cicerone e il teatro. Appunti per una rivisitazione della problematica", in E. Narducci (ed.), *Cicerone tra antichi e moderni* (Florence) 6–37.
- 2005. "L'*Atrius* di Accio e il mito del tiranno: osservazioni in margine a uno studio di Italo Lana", in F. Bessone and E. Malaspina (eds.), *Politica e cultura in Roma antica: Atti dell'incontro di studio in ricordo di Italo Lana* (Bologna) 19–34.
- Arkins, B. 1982. "Tradition Reshaped: Language and Style in Euripides' *Medea* 1–19, Ennius' *Medea Exul* 1–9 and Catullus 64, 1–30", *Ramus* 11: 116–33.
- Armisen-Marchetti, M. 2000. "Sénèque et la divination", in P. Parroni (ed.), *Seneca e il suo tempo, Atti del Convegno internazionale di Roma-Cassino*, 11–14 novembre 1998 (Rome) 193–214.
- Artaud, A. 1961. *Oeuvres Complètes*, vols. 2&3. Paris.
- Artigas, E. (ed.), 1990. *Pacuviana. Marco Pacuvio en Cicerón, Aurea Saecula* 3.
- (ed.), 2009. *Marc Pacuvi: Tragèdies. Fragments, Col·lecció de clàssics grecs i llatins* 376.

- Ashcroft, B. 2009. *Caliban's Voice: The Transformation of English in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London.
- Augoustakis, A. 2010. "Mercator Paratragoedans: Plautus Rewrites Teucer's Exile", *NECJ* 37: 79–88.
- Auhagen, U. 1999. *Der Monolog bei Ovid*. Tübingen.
- 2000. "Ennius' *Andromacha* im politischen Kontext der Zeit", in G. Manuwald (ed.), *Identität und Alterität in der frühromischen Tragödie* (Würzburg) 199–210.
- 2002. "Accius' *Antenoridae*: Zwischen Aitiologie und Tagespolitik", in S. Faller and G. Manuwald (eds.), *Accius und seine Zeit* (Würzburg) 229–43.
- 2007. "Rhetoric in Ovid", in W.J. Dominik and J. Hall (eds.), *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*. Malden: MA 413–24.
- Austin, R.G. (ed.), 1977. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber sextus*. Oxford.
- Auvray-Assayas, C. 1998. "Relectures philosophiques de la tragédie: les citations tragiques dans l'œuvre de Cicéron", in M.-H. Garelli-Francois (ed.), *Rome et le tragique*, *Pallas* 49: 269–277.
- Aygon, J.-P. 2004. *Pictor in fabula. L'ecphrasis—descriptio dans les tragédies de Sénèque*. Brussels.
- 2006. "Les tragédies de Sénèque: des textes pour la scène? L'exemple de l'*extispicium* dans *Oedipus*", in J. Chr. Dumont (ed.), *De la tablette à la scène. Actes du colloque de Nanterre (31 octobre–1er novembre 2004)*, *Pallas* 71: 91–112.
- 2013. "Redit memoria... (v. 768): l'intériorisation du conflit tragique dans *Oedipus* de Sénèque", *VL* 187/188: 146–63.
- 2014a. "Les tragédies de Sénèque: cohérence dramaturgique, mise en scène et interprétation 'stoïcienne'", in J.-P. Aygon (ed.), *Sénèque, un philosophe homme de théâtre?* *Pallas* 95: 13–32.
- 2014b. "Les apartés dans le théâtre de Sénèque: mode de sélection et corpus", in P. Paré-Rey (ed.), *L'Aperté dans le théâtre antique* (Paris) 103–27.
- Forthcoming. *Vt scaena, sic uita. Mise en scène et dévoilement dans les œuvres philosophiques et dramatiques de Sénèque*. Paris.
- Baertschi, A.M. 2010. "Drama and Epic Narrative: The Test Case of Messenger Speech in Seneca's *Agamemnon*", in I. Gildenhard and M. Revermann (eds.), *Beyond the Fifth Century. Interactions with Greek Tragedy from the Fourth Century BCE to the Middle Ages* (Berlin) 243–63.
- 2013. *Nekyiai. Totenbeschwörung und Unterweltsbegegnung im neronisch-flavischen Epos*. Berlin.
- Bagordo, A. 2002. "Dichtung und Philologie bei Accius am Beispiel seiner Gräzismen und Calquen", in S. Faller and G. Manuwald (eds.), *Accius und seine Zeit* (Würzburg) 39–49.

- Baier, T. 2000. "Pacuvius, *Niptra*", in G. Manuwald (ed.), *Identität und Alterität in der frühromischen Tragödie* (Würzburg) 285–300.
- Baldarelli, B. 2004. *Accius und die vortrojanische Pelopidensage*. Paderborn.
- Ballaira, G. 2002. "Comments on Kragelund", *SO* 77.1: 52–88.
- Barchiesi, A. 1993. "Future reflexive: two modes of allusion and Ovid's *Heroides*", *HSCP* 95: 333–65.
- Barlow, S.A. 1971. *The Imagery of Euripides. A Study in the Dramatic Use of Pictorial Language*. London.
- Barner, W. 1973. *Produktive Rezeption: Lessing und die Tragödien Senecas*. Munich.
- Barrett, J. 2002. *Staged Narrative. Poetics and the Messenger in Greek Tragedy*. Berkeley.
- Bartsch, S. 1994. *Actors in the Audience: Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*. Cambridge, Mass.
- 2006. *The Mirror of the Self: Sexuality, Self-Knowledge and the Gaze in the Early Roman Empire*. Chicago.
- Bartsch, S. & Elsner, J. 2007. "Introduction: Eight Ways of Looking at an Ekphrasis", *CP* 102: i–vi.
- Bate, J. 1989. *Shakespearean constitutions: politics, theatre, criticism 1730–1830*. Oxford.
- Baugh, C. 2007. "Scenography and technology", in J. Moody & D. O'Quinn (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to British Theatre 1730–1830*. Cambridge.
- Beacham, R.C. 1992. *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience*. Cambridge, Mass.
- 1999. *Spectacle Entertainments of Early Imperial Rome*. New Haven, CT.
- Beard, M. 2007. *The Roman Triumph*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Beard, M., North, J. and Price, S. 1998. *Religions of Rome*. vol. 1. Cambridge.
- Beare, W. 1955. *The Roman Stage. A Short History of Latin Drama in the Time of the Republic*. London.
- Bellandi, F. 1997. "Tra Seneca e Sofocle: sulla scena d'apertura dell'*Octavia* di Ps.-Seneca", *Paideia* 52: 31–56.
- Bernal, M. 1987. *Black Athena: the Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization: the Fabrication of Ancient Greece*. London.
- Bernstein, F. 2000. "Der römische Sieg bei Clastidium und die zeitgeschichtliche Praetexta des Naevius", in G. Manuwald (ed.), *Identität und Alterität in der frühromischen Tragödie* (Würzburg) 157–73.
- Bessone, F. 1997. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistula XII. Medea Iasoni*. Florence.
- Beus, Y.T. 2003. *Towards a Paradoxical Theatre: Schlegelian Irony in German and French Romantic Drama 1797–1843*. New York.
- Bhabha, H. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London.
- Bianco, M.M. 2006. "*Ut Medea Peliam concoxit... item ego te faciam*. La Medea in Plauto", in G. Petrone and M.M. Bianco (eds.), *La commedia di Plauto e la parodia: il lato comico dei paradigmi tragici*. Palermo. [= *Leuconoe* 9: 53–79].

- Bilinski, B. 1958. *Accio ed i Gracchi. Contributo alla storia della plebe e della tragedia romana*. Rome.
- 1960. "Dulorestes de Pacuvius et les guerres serviles en Sicile", *Hommages à L. Herrmann* (Brussels) 160–70.
- Billerbeck, M. (ed.), 1999. *Seneca, Hercules furens. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Leiden.
- Bishop, J.D. 1978. "Seneca's *Oedipus*: Opposition Literature", *CJ* 73.4: 289–301.
- Blänsdorf, J. 1993. "Plautus, *Amphitruo* und *Rudens*—oder wieviel literarische Parodie verträgt eine populäre Komödie?", in W. Ax and R. Gleis (eds.), *Literaturparodie in Antike und Mittelalter* (Trier) 57–47.
- 2008. "Accius als Vorläufer Senecas", in L. Castagna and C. Riboldi (eds.), *Amicitiae Templa Serena: Studi in Onore Di Giuseppe Aricò*, 2 vols. (Milan) 177–93.
- Boscherini, S. 1958. "Su di un frammento tragico latino", *SIFC* 30: 106–15.
- Bosher, K. (ed.), 2012. *Theater Outside Athens. Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy*. Cambridge.
- Bowditch, P.L. 2011. "Tibullus and Egypt: a Postcolonial Reading of *Elegy* 1.7", *Arethusa* 44: 89–122.
- Bowie, A.M. 1997. "Tragic Filters for History: Euripides' *Suppliants* and Sophocles' *Philoctetes*", in C.B.R. Pelling (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford) 39–62.
- Boyle, A.J. 1983. "*Hic epulis locus*: The Tragic Worlds of Seneca's *Agamemnon* and *Thyestes*", in A.J. Boyle (ed.), *Seneca Tragicus. Ramus Essays on Senecan Drama* (Berwick 1983), 199–228 [= *Ramus* 12].
- 1985. "In Nature's Bonds: A Study of Seneca's *Phaedra*", in: *ANRW* II: 32.2 (Berlin) 1284–1347.
- 1987a. "Senecan Tragedy: Twelve Propositions", *Ramus* 16: 78–101.
- 1987b. *Seneca's Phaedra*. Liverpool.
- 1997. *Tragic Seneca: An Essay in the Theatrical Tradition*. London.
- 2006. *An Introduction to Roman Tragedy*. London.
- 2008. *Octavia Attributed to Seneca*. Oxford.
- (ed.), 2011. *Seneca. Oedipus. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Oxford.
- 2014. *Seneca. Medea. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Brandt, J. 1986. *Argumentative Struktur in Senecas Tragödien. Eine Untersuchung anhand der Phaedra und des Agamemnon*. Hildesheim.
- Brathwaite, E.K. 1984. *History of the Voice: The Development of Nation Language in Anglophone Caribbean Poetry*. London.
- Bremer, J.M. 1976. "Why Messenger-Speeches?", in J.M. Bremer, S. Radt and C.J. Ruijgh (eds.), *Miscellanea tragica in honorem J.C. Kamerbeek* (Amsterdam) 29–48.
- Brett-Smith, H. (ed.), 1909. *Peacock's memoirs of Shelley, with Shelley's letters to Peacock*. London.

- Brink, C.O. (ed.), 1971. *Horace on Poetry*, vol. 2. Cambridge.
- 1963. *Horace on Poetry*, vol. 1. Cambridge.
- Brown, A.L. 1987. "The Dramatic Synopses Attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium", *CQ* 37: 427–31.
- Brown, J.K. 2004. "Drama and Theatrical Practice in Classical Weimar", in S. Richter (ed.), *The literature of Weimar Classicism* (Rochester) 7: 133–168.
- Buckley, E. 2013. "Senecan Tragedy", in E. Buckley and M.T. Dinter (eds.), *A Companion to the Neronian Age* (Malden, MA) 204–24.
- Budelmann, F. 2007. "The Reception of Sophocles' Representation of Physical Pain", *AJP* 128: 443–67.
- Bureau, Br. and Christian, N. 2014. "*Hoc apud se*: la conscience de l'aparté et de ses potentialités comiques chez Donat commentateur de Térence", in P. Paré-Rey (ed.), *L'Aparté dans le théâtre antique* (Paris) 251–94.
- Burian P.H. 1972. "Supplication and Hero Cult in Sophocles' *Ajax*", *GRBS* 13: 151–56.
- 1974. "Suppliant and Saviour. *Oedipus at Colonus*", *Phoenix* 28: 408–29.
- Burman, P. 1727. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera Omnia*. Amsterdam.
- 1759. *Anthologia Veterum Latinorum Epigrammatum et Poematum*. Amsterdam.
- Burton, J.B. 1995. *Theocritus' Urban Mimes. Mobility, Gender and Patronage*. Berkeley.
- Bussels, S. 2012. *The Animated Image. Roman Theory on Naturalism, Vividness and Divine Power*. Berlin.
- Butler, E.M. 1935. *The Tyranny of Greece over Germany: a Study of the Influence Exercised by Greek Art and Poetry over the Great German Writers of the Eighteenth, Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Cambridge.
- Butler, H.E. 1909. *Post-Augustan Poetry*. Oxford.
- Buttram C. 2009. "Sweeney Agonistes: A Sensational Snarl", in E. David (ed.), *A Companion to T.S. Eliot* (Malden, MA) 179–90.
- Calder, W.M. 1976. "Seneca: Tragedian of Imperial Rome", *CJ* 72: 1–11.
- 1983. "*Secreti loquimur*: An Interpretation of Seneca's *Thyestes*", in A.J. Boyle (ed.), *Seneca Tragicus: Ramus Essays on Senecan Drama*. (Berwick) 184–97.
- Cancik, H. 1978. "Die republikanische Tragödie", in E. Lefèvre (ed.), *Das Römische Drama* (Darmstadt) 308–47.
- Cantor, P. 1976. "A Distorting Mirror: Shelley's *The Cenci* and Shakespearean Tragedy", in G. Evans (ed.), *Shakespeare: aspects of influence* (Cambridge, Mass.) 91–108.
- Carlson, M. 1978. *Goethe and the Weimar theatre*. Cornell.
- Carter, D.M. (ed.), 2007. *The Politics of Greek Tragedy*. Exeter.
- 2011. *Why Athens? A Reappraisal of Tragic Politics*. Oxford.
- Casaceli, F. 1976. *Lingua e stile in Accio*. Palermo.
- Castagna, L. 2002. "Osservazioni sul *Brutus* di Accio", in S. Faller and G. Manuwald (eds.), *Accius und seine Zeit: Identitäten und Alteritäten* (Würzburg) 79–103.
- Cataudella, Q. 1963. "Eschilo in Sicilia", *Dioniso* 37: 5–24.

- Caviglia, F. 1986–1987. “Elementi di tradizione epica nell’*Agamemnon* di Seneca”, *QCTC* 4–5: 145–65.
- Champlin, E. 2003. “*Agamemnon* at Rome: Roman Dynasts and Greek Heroes”, in D. Braund & C. Gill (eds.), *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome. Studies in honour of T.P. Wiseman* (Exeter) 295–319.
- Chaumartin, F.G. (ed.), 1999. *Sénèque. Tragédies*, t. 2. Paris.
- 2002. “Octavie, une œuvre à la croisée de divers chemins (comments on Kragelund)”, *SO* 77.1: 57–60.
- Cheyfitz, E. 1991. *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from The Tempest to Tarzan*. New York.
- Chew, S. & Richards, D. (eds.), 2010. *A Concise Companion to Postcolonial Literature*. Malden, Mass.
- Chinitz, D.E. 2003. *T.S. Eliot and the Cultural Divide*. Chicago.
- Ciofanus, H. 1582. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistolae Heroides*. Antwerp.
- Claes, P. 1984. *Claus-reading*. Antwerp.
- 1984. *De Mot Zit in de Mythe: Hugo Claus en de oudheid*. Amsterdam.
- 1985. “Claus’ oedipodie”, *Dietsche Warande & Belfort* (Leuven) 506–12.
- Claus, H. 1966. *Thyestes, naar Seneca*. Ghent.
- 1975. *Oedipus, naar Seneca*. Amsterdam.
- 1980. *Phaedra, naar Seneca*. Amsterdam.
- 1985. *Blindeman*. Amsterdam.
- Coffey, M. & Mayer, R. (eds.), 1990. *Seneca. Phaedra*. Cambridge.
- Coleman K.M. 1990. “Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged As Mythological Enactments”, *JRS* 80: 44–73.
- Conte, G.B. 1991. *Generi e lettori. Lucrezio, l’elegia d’amore, l’enciclopedia di Plinio*. Milan.
- 1994. *Latin Literature: A History*. Joseph B. Solodow (tr.). Baltimore.
- Cooper, J.X. 2006. *The Cambridge Introduction to T.S. Eliot*. Cambridge.
- Corsaro, F. 1978–1979. “*L’Iliupersis* nell’*Agamemnon* di Seneca”, *Helikon* 18–19: 301–39.
- Costa, C.D.N. 1973. *Seneca: Medea*. Oxford.
- Cousland, J.R.C. & Hume, J.R. (eds.), 2009. *The Play of Texts and Fragments: Essays in Honour of Martin Cropp* (Leiden) 141–56.
- Cowan, R. 2010. “A Stranger in a Strange Land. Medea in Roman Republican Tragedy”, in H. Bartel & A. Simon (eds.), *Unbinding Medea. Interdisciplinary Approaches to a Classical Myth* (Oxford) 39–52.
- 2013a. “Haven’t I seen you before somewhere? Optical allusions in Republican tragedy”, in G.W.M. Harrison & V. Liapis (eds.), *Performance in Greek and Roman Theatre* (Leiden) 311–42.
- 2013b. “Fear and Loathing in Lucretius: Latent Tragedy and Anti-Allusion in *DRN* 3”, in T.D. Papangelis, S.J. Harrison & S. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature: Encounters, Interactions and Transformations* (Berlin) 113–33.

- Cox, J.N. 2002. "English Gothic theatre", in J.E. Hogle (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Gothic fiction*. (Cambridge) 125–44.
- Csapo, E. 2010. *Actors and Icons of the Ancient Theater*. Chichester.
- Csapo, E., Goette, H.R., Green, J.R., & Wilson, P.J. (eds.), 2014. *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century BC*. Berlin.
- Cunliffe, J.W. 1893. *The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy*. London.
- Cunningham, M.P. 1949. "The Novelty of Ovid's *Heroides*", *CPh* 44: 100–06.
- Curley, D. 2013. *Tragedy in Ovid. Theater, Metatheater, and the Transformation of a Genre*. Cambridge.
- Curran, S. 1970. *Shelley's Cenci: Scorpions Ringed with Fire*. Princeton.
- Currie, H.M. 1981. "Ovid and the Roman Stage", *ANRW* 11: 31.4 (Berlin) 2701–42.
- D'Anna, G. (ed.), 1967. *M. Pacuvii fragmenta*, Rome 3.1.
- D'Anselmi, L.A. 2014. *Mimetic Syntax in the Tragedies of Seneca*, MA Thesis. Bryn Mawr.
- D'Antò, V. (ed.), 1980. *L. Accio. I frammenti delle tragedie*. Lecce.
- Damon, C. 2010. "Déjà vu or Déjà lu? History as Intertext", *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 14: 375–88.
- Damrosch, D. 2003. *What is World Literature?* Princeton.
- Damschen, G. & Heil, A. (eds.), 2014. *Brill's Companion to Seneca. Philosopher and Dramatist*. Leiden.
- Dangel, J. (ed.), 1995. *Accius. Œuvres (fragments)*. Paris.
- 1998. "Tragédie républicaine méconnue: les actes fondateurs de Livius Andronicus", *Pallas* 49: 53–71.
- Davis, P.J. 1983. "*Vindicat omnes natura sibi*: A Reading of Seneca's *Phaedra*", in A.J. Boyle (ed.), *Seneca Tragicus. Ramus Essays on Senecan Drama* (Berwick) 114–27 [= *Ramus* 12].
- 1993. *Shifting Song: The Chorus in Seneca's Tragedies*. Hildesheim.
- 2003. *Seneca: Thyestes*. London.
- De Decker, J. 1971. *Over Claus' toneel*. Antwerp.
- Dearden, C.W. 1990. "Fourth-Century Tragedy in Sicily: Athenian or Sicilian?", in J.P. Descoeudres (ed.), *Greek Colonists and Native Populations* (Oxford) 231–42.
- 1999. "Plays for Export", *Phoenix* 53: 222–48.
- Decreus, F. 1992. "Van Oedipus naar Blindeman, van Seneca naar Claus", in van der Paardt R. and Decreus, F. (eds.), *Dodelijke dikke Wolken*, Leidse Opstellen 18: 23–73.
- Degiovanni, L. 2004. "Sui modelli nell'*Agamemnon* di Seneca: Tre note testuali e interpretative", *SCO* 50: 373–95.
- 2010. *Hercules Oetaeus: una tragedia attribuita a Seneca: Introduzione, testo e commento dei vv. 1–705*. PhD thesis.
- Degl'Innocenti Pierini, R. 1980. *Studi su Accio*. Florence.

- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. 2004. *A Thousand Plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia*. London.
- Dhuga, U. 2011. *Choral Identity and the Chorus of Elders in Greek Tragedy*, Lanham, MD.
- Di Benedetto Zimbone, A. 1973. "L'Atreus di Accio", *SicGymn* 26: 266–85.
- Di Giuseppe, L. 2004. "Euripide e la grecità dei Macedoni: Archelao presso Cisseo", *Prometheus* 30: 125–28.
- Di Gregorio, L. 1967. *Le scene d'annuncio nella tragedia greca*. Milan.
- Diderot, D. 1769 [repr. 1995]. *Paradoxe sur le comédien*, A. Menil (ed.), Paris.
- Dilthey, K. 1863. *De Callimachi Cydippa*. Leipzig.
- Dingel, J. 1974. *Seneca und die Dichtung*. Heidelberg.
- 1985. "Senecas Tragödien. Vorbilder und poetische Aspekte", *ANRW* 11: 32.2 (Berlin) 1052–99.
- 2009. *Die relative Datierung der Tragödien Senecas*. Berlin.
- Dixon, R. 2010. *Haec urbs Roma est, ubi haec agitur fabula: Place, Space and Spatial Dramaturgy in the Plautine Theatre*. Diss. Sydney.
- Dobrov, G.W. 2001. *Figures of Play: Greek Drama and Metafictional Poetics*. Oxford.
- Dougherty, C. 1991. "Linguistic Colonialism in Aeschylus' *Aetnaeae*", *GRBS* 22: 119–32.
- Douglas, A.E. 1990. *Cicero, Tusculan disputations II & V, with a summary of III & IV. Ed. with an Introduction, translation and commentary*. Warminster.
- Dueck, D. 2009. "Poetic quotations in Latin prose works of philosophy," *Hermes* 137: 314–34.
- Duhot, J.-J. 1989. *La conception stoïcienne de la causalité*. Paris.
- Dumont, J. Chr. and François-Garelli, M.-H. 1998. *Le Théâtre à Rome*. Paris.
- Duncan, A. 2011. "Nothing to do with Athens? Tragedians at the Courts of Tyrants", in D.M. Carter (ed.), *Why Athens? A Reappraisal of Tragic Politics* (Oxford) 69–84.
- Dunn, F. 1994. "Euripides and the Rites of Hera Akraia.", *GRBS* 35: 103–15.
- 1996. *Tragedy's End: Closure and Innovation in Euripidean Drama*. Oxford.
- 2000. "Euripidean Aetiologies", *CB* 76: 3–28.
- Dupont, F. 1985. *L'acteur-roi: le théâtre à Rome*. Paris.
- Easterling, P.E. 1985. "Anachronism in Greek Tragedy", *JHS* 105: 1–10.
- Edwards, C. 2007. *Death in Ancient Rome*. New Haven.
- Eigler, U. 2000. "Cicero und die römische Tragödie. Eine Strategie zur Legitimation philosophischer Literatur im philosophischen Spätwerk Ciceros", in E. Stärk and G. Vogt-Spira (eds.), *Dramatische Wäldchen. Festschrift für Eckard Lefèvre zum 65.* (Hildesheim) 619–36.
- Elam, K. 1980. *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*. London.
- Eliot, T.S. 1921. *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism*. New York.
- 1932. *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism*. London.
- 1933. *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism*. Cambridge, Mass.
- ²1934. "Seneca in English Translation", *Selected Essays* (London) 65–105.

- . 1957. *On Poetry and Poets*. New York.
- . 1964. *Selected Essays*. New York.
- . 1971. *The Complete Poems and Plays 1909–1950*. New York.
- . 1975. *Selected Prose of T.S. Eliot*, ed. Frank Kermode. New York.
- Eliot, V. & Haffenden, J. (eds.), 2012. *The Letters of T.S. Eliot*, vol 3: 1926–1927. New Haven.
- Eliot, V. & Haughton, H. (eds.), 1988. *The Letters of T.S. Eliot*, vol 1: 1898–1922. San Diego.
- Elliott, J. 2013. *Ennius and the Architecture of the Annales*. Cambridge.
- Ellis, R. 2005. “Docticity Fecundity Interiority in Pleonastic Pacuvian Psychology”, *Ramus* 34: 112–26.
- Endo, P. 1996. “The Cenci Recognizing the Shelleyan Sublime”, *Texas Studies in Language and Literature* 38: 379–97.
- Erasmio, M. 2004. *Roman Tragedy: From Theatre to Theatricality*. Austin.
- . 2006. “Enticing Tantalus in Seneca’s *Thyestes*”, *MD* 56: 185–98.
- . 2008. *Reading Death in Ancient Rome*. Columbus.
- Erdmann, G. 1964. *Der Botenbericht bei Euripides. Struktur und dramatische Funktion*, Diss. Kiel.
- Erskine, A. 2001. *Troy between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power*. Oxford.
- Esslin, M. 1976. *Artaud*. Glasgow.
- Ewton, R.W. 1972. *The Literary Theories of August Wilhelm Schlegel*. The Hague.
- Faber, R.A. 2007. “The Description of the Palace in Seneca *Thyestes* 641–82 and the Literary Unity of the Play”, *Mnemosyne* 60: 427–42.
- Faider, P. 1922 “Sénèque De ira 1, 1, 4 et la Médée d’Ovide”, *Musée Belge* 27: 131–33.
- Faller, S. & Manuwald, G. (eds.), 2002. *Accius und seine Zeit*. Würzburg.
- Faller, S. (ed.), 2001. *Studien zu antiken Identitäten*. Würzburg.
- . 2000. “Romanisierungstendenzen in der *Iphigenia* des Ennius”, in G. Manuwald (ed.), *Identität und Alterität in der frühromischen Tragödie* (Würzburg) 211–29.
- . 2008. “Römisches’ in Ennius’ *Hectoris Lytra*”, in L. Castagna & C. Riboldi (eds.), *Amicitiae templa serena: Studi in onore di Giuseppe Aricò* (Milan) 1: 523–50.
- Fantham, E. 1982. *Seneca’s Troades*. Princeton.
- . 2000. “Production of Seneca’s *Trojan Women*, Ancient? And Modern”, in G.W.M. Harrison (ed.), *Seneca in Performance* (Swansea) 13–26.
- . 2003. “Pacuvius: Melodrama, Reversals and Recognitions”, in D. Braund and C. Gill (eds.), *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome* (Exeter) 98–118.
- . 2004. *The Roman World of Cicero’s De Oratore*. Oxford.
- . 2005. “The Family Sagas of the Houses of Aeacus and Pelops: From Ennius to Accius”, *Dioniso* 4: 56–71.
- Feeney, D. 2005. “The Beginnings of a Literature in Latin”, *JRS* 95: 226–40.

- Feldman, P. & Scott-Kilvert, D. (eds.), 1987. *The Journals of Mary Shelley 1814–1844*. Baltimore.
- Ferenczi, A. 2001. "Some Generic Problems of Senecan Drama", *AAntHung* 41: 255–61.
- Ferri, R. (ed.), 2002. "Comments on Kragelund", *SO* 77.1: 60–68.
- 2003a. *Octavia: a Play Attributed to Seneca*. Cambridge.
- 2003b. "Octavia and the Roman Dramatic Tradition in *The Tragedy of Nero's Wife: Studies on the Octavia Praetexta*", in M. Wilson (ed.), *Prudentia* 35.1: 89–111.
- 2014. "Octavia", in A. Heil and G. Damschen (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Seneca: Philosopher and Dramatist* (Leiden) 521–30.
- Filippi M. 2011. "L'Andromeda di Accio", *Rend. Mor. Acc. Lincei* Series 9. vol. 22.
- Finglass, P.J. (ed.), 2011. *Sophocles: Ajax*. Cambridge.
- Fischer-Lichte, E. 1999. "Between text and cultural performance: staging Greek tragedies in Germany", *Theatre Survey* 40.1: 1–30.
- Fischl, J. 1910. *De nuntiis tragicis*. Vienna.
- Fitch, J.G. (ed.), 1981. "Sense-Pauses and Relative Dating in Seneca, Sophocles and Shakespeare", *AJP* 102: 289–07.
- 1987. *Seneca's Hercules Furens*. Ithaca.
- 2000. "Playing Seneca", in G.W.M. Harrison (ed.), *Seneca in Performance* (Swansea) 1–12.
- 2002–2004. *L. Annaeus Seneca. Tragedies*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Flower, H.I. 1995. "Praetextae in Context: When Were Plays on Contemporary Subjects Performed in Republican Rome?", *CQ* 45.1: 170–90.
- 2000. "Fabula de Bacchanalibus: The Bacchanalian Cult of the Second Century BC and Roman Drama", in G. Manuwald (ed.), *Identität und Alterität in der frühromischen Tragödie* (Würzburg) 23–36.
- 2002. "Roman Historical Drama and Nero on Stage (Comments on Kragelund)", *SO* 77.1: 68–72.
- 2006. *The Art of Forgetting: Disgrace and Oblivion in Roman Political Culture*. Chapel Hill.
- Fontaine, M. 2009. *Funny Words in Plautine Comedy*. Oxford.
- Fortey, S. and Glucker, J. 1975. "Actus Tragicus: Seneca on the Stage", *Latomus* 34: 699–715.
- Fraenkel, E. 1942. "The Stars in the Prologue of the *Rudens*", *CQ* 36: 10–14.
- 2007. *Plautine Elements in Plautus*. T. Drevikovsky and F. Muecke (trs.). Oxford. [= E. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, Berlin 1922].
- François-Garelli, M-H. 1998. "Tradition littéraire et création dramatique dans les tragédies de Sénèque: L'exemple des récits de messagers", *Latomus* 57: 15–32.
- Frangoulidis, S.A. 1996. "Counter-Theatricalization in Plautus' 'Captivi' III.4", *Mnemosyne* 49: 144–58.

- Frank, M. 1995. *Seneca's Phoenissae*. Leiden.
- Frank, T. 1932. "Two Notes on Plautus: 1. Parody in Act v of Plautus' *Mercator*", *AJP* 53: 243–51.
- Fränkel, H. 1945. *Ovid. A Poet between two Worlds*. Los Angeles.
- Franklin, J.L. 1991. "Literacy and the Parietal Inscriptions of Pompeii", in J.H. Humphrey (ed.), *Literacy in the Roman World*, *JRA*, Supplementary Series 3 (Ann Arbor) 76–98.
- Friedlaender, L. 1920. *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, 11. Leipzig.
- Friedrich, W-H. 1956. "Episches Unwetter", *Festschrift Bruno Snell* (Munich) 77–87.
- Fugmann, J. 1988. *Römisches Theater in der Provinz*. Stuttgart. [repr. Freiburg 2013].
- Funaioli G. 1920. "recitationes", in *RE* series 2, volume 1, cols. 435–46.
- Furley, W.D. 1992. "Seneca's Horrible Bull: *Phaedra* 1007–1034", *CQ* 42: 562–66.
- Gabba, E. 1969. "Il Brutus di Accio", *Dioniso* 48: 377–83.
- Garbarino, G. 1973. *Roma e la filosofia greca dalle origini alla fine del 11 secolo a. C.* 2 vols. Turin.
- Garelli, M-H. 2007. "La *praetexta* à Rome: une autre réception de la tragédie grecque", in B. Le Guen, (ed.), *À chacun sa tragédie? Retour sur la tragédie grecque* (Rennes) 141–65.
- Garnier, R. 1974. "Hippolyte", in R. Lebègue (ed.), *Budé series* (Paris) 99–204.
- Garvie, A.F. (ed.), 2009. *Aeschylus' Persae*. Oxford.
- Gatti, P.L. 2014. *Ovid in Antike und Mittelalter. Geschichte der philologischen Rezeption*. Stuttgart.
- Gildenhard, I. 2007. *Paideia Romana: Cicero's Tusculan Disputations*. Cambridge.
- 2008. Review: Petra Schierl, *Die Tragödien des Pacuvius: ein Kommentar mit Einleitung, Text und Übersetzung*, *BMCR* 04: 31.
- 2010. "Buskins & *SPQR*: Roman Receptions of Greek Tragedy", in I. Gildenhard and M. Revermann (eds.), *Beyond the Fifth Century: Interactions with Greek Tragedy from the Fourth Century BCE to the Middle Ages* (Berlin) 153–85.
- Gildenhard, I. and Revermann, M. (eds.), 2010. *Beyond the Fifth Century: Interactions with Greek Tragedy from the Fourth Century BCE to the Middle Ages*. Berlin.
- Gildenhard, I. and Zissos, A., 1999. "'Somatic Economies': Tragic Bodies and Poetic Design in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*", in P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi and S. Hinds, (eds.), *Ovidian Transformations. Essays on the Metamorphoses and its Reception* (Cambridge) 162–81.
- Gill, C. 1997. "Passion as Madness in Roman Poetry", in S.M. Braund and C. Gill (eds.), *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature* (Cambridge) 213–41.
- Giomini, R (ed.), 1956. *L. Annaei Senecae Agamemnona*. Rome.
- Giusta, M. 1984. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanae disputationes*. Turin.
- Glynn, R. 1981. "Herakles, Nereus and Triton: A Study of Iconography in Sixth Century Athens", *AJA* 85: 121–32.

- Goff, B. (ed.), 2005. *Classics and Colonialism*. London.
- Goff, B. and Simpson, M. (eds.), 2007. *Crossroads in the Black Aegean: Oedipus, Antigone, and Dramas of the African Diaspora*. Oxford.
- Goldberg, S.M. 1986. *Understanding Terence*. Princeton, N.J.
- 1989. "Poetry, Politics, and Ennius", *TAPA* 119: 247–61.
- 1995. *Epic in Republican Rome*. New York.
- 1996. "The Fall and Rise of Roman Tragedy", *TAPA* 126: 265–86.
- 1997. "Melpomene's Declamation (Rhetoric and Tragedy)", in W.J. Dominik (ed.), *Roman Eloquence. Rhetoric in Society and Literature* (London) 166–81.
- 1998. "Plautus on the Palatine", *JRS* 88: 1–20.
- 2000a. "Going for Baroque: Seneca and the English", in G.W.M. Harrison (ed.), *Seneca in Performance* (Swansea) 209–31.
- 2000b. "Cicero and the Work of Tragedy", in G. Manuwald (ed.), *Identität und Alterität in der frühromischen Tragödie* (Würzburg) 49–59.
- 2003. "Authorizing Octavia", in M. Wilson (ed.), *The Tragedy of Nero's Wife: Studies on the Octavia Praetexta*, *Prudentia* 35.1: 13–36.
- 2005. *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic. Poetry and Its Reception*. Cambridge.
- 2007. "Research Report: Reading Roman Tragedy", *IJCT* 13: 571–84.
- Goldhill, S. 1990. "The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology", in J.J. Winkler & F.I. Zeitlin (eds.), *Nothing to do with Dionysos?: Athenian Drama in its Social Context* (Princeton) 97–129.
- Gordon, L. 1999. *T.S. Eliot: An Imperfect Life*. New York.
- Gould, D.W. 1970. "Ovid, *Heroides* 16, 45–46", *HSPH* 74: 187–91.
- Gould, J. 1996. "Tragedy and Collective Experience", in M. Silk (ed.), *Tragedy and the Tragic* (Oxford) 217–43.
- Goward, B. 1999. *Telling Tragedy. Narrative Technique in Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides*. London.
- Gowers, E. 2007. "The *cor* of Ennius", in W. Fitzgerald and E. Gowers (eds.), *Ennius Perennis: The Annals and Beyond* (Cambridge) 17–37.
- Grair, C.A. 2005. "Antiquity and Weimar Classicism", in S. Richter (ed.), *The Literature of Weimar Classicism* (New York) 63–88.
- Grant, John N. 1986. *Studies in the Textual Tradition of Terence*. Toronto.
- Gratwick, A.S. 1982. "Drama" in W.V. Clausen and E.J. Kenney (eds.), *CHCL* 2.5: 77–137.
- Greenblatt, S. 1976. "Learning to Curse. Aspects of Linguistic Colonialism in the Sixteenth Century", in F. Chiappelli (ed.), *First Images of America: The Impact of the New World on the Old* (Berkeley) 561–80.
- Griffin, J. (ed.), 1998. "The Social Function of Greek Tragedy", *CQ* 48: 39–61.
- 1999a. *Sophocles Revisited: Essays Presented to Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones*. Oxford.

- 1999b. "Sophocles and the Tragic City", in J. Griffin (ed.), *Sophocles Revisited* (Oxford) 73–94.
- Griffin, M. 1992. *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics*. Oxford.
- Grilli, A. 1987. *Marco Tullio Cicerone, Tuscolane, Libro 11. Testo, versione e commento*. Brescia.
- Grimal, P. 1975. *Le théâtre à Rome*. Paris.
- Gruen, E.S. 1990. *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy*. Leiden.
- 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca.
- Gupta, S. 2009. *Globalization and Literature*. Cambridge.
- Gutjahr, O. 2006. *Penthesilea von Henrich von Kleist: Geschlechter Szenen in Stephan Kimmigs Inszenierung am Thalia Theater Hamburg*. Würzburg.
- Habib, M.A.R. 1999. *The Early T.S. Eliot and Western Philosophy*. Cambridge.
- Habinek, T.N. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature*. Princeton.
- 2005. *The World of Roman Song: From Ritualized Speech to Social Order*. Oxford.
- Hall, E. 1989. *Inventing the Barbarian. Greek Self-definition through Tragedy*. Oxford.
- (ed.), 1996. *Aeschylus. The Persians*. Warminster.
- 2013. "Pantomime: Visualising Myth in the Roman Empire", in G.W.M. Harrison and V. Liapis (eds.), *Performance in Greek and Roman Theatre* (Leiden) 451–73.
- Hall, E. and Macintosh, F. 2005. *Greek tragedy and the British theatre 1660–1914*. Oxford.
- Hardie, Ph. 1997. "Virgil and Tragedy", in C. Martindale (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge) 312–26.
- Hardwick, L. 2011. "Fuzzy connections: classical texts and modern poetry in English", in J. Parker & T. Mathews (eds.), *Tradition, Translation, Trauma: the classic and the modern* (Oxford) 39–60.
- Hardwick, L. & Gillespie, C. (eds.), 2007. *Classics in post-colonial worlds*. Oxford.
- Harris, W.V. 1989. *Ancient Literacy*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Harrison, G.W.M. 1999. "Claudian Castores: Seneca and Crispus", in S. Byrne and E.P. Cueva (eds.), *Veritatis Amicitiaeque Causa: Essays in Honor of Anna Lydia Motto and John R. Clark* (Wauconda, Illinois) 113–28.
- (ed.), 2000a. *Seneca in Performance*. Swansea.
- 2000b. "Semper ego auditor tantum? Performance and physical setting of Seneca's plays", in G.W.M. Harrison (ed.), *Seneca in Performance* (Swansea) 137–49.
- 2000c. "Introduction", in G.W.M. Harrison (ed.), *Seneca in Performance* (London) vii–xi.
- 2003. "Forms of intertextuality in the *Octavia*", in M. Wilson (ed.), *The Tragedy of Nero's Wife: Studies on the Octavia Praetexta, Prudentia* 35.1: 112–25.
- Harrison, G.W.M. 2014a. "Characters", in A. Heil and G. Damschen (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Seneca: Philosopher and Dramatist* (Leiden) 593–613.

- 2014b. "Themes", in A. Heil and G. Damschen (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Seneca: Philosopher and Dramatist* (Leiden) 615–38.
- Harrison, G.W.M. and Liapis, V. (eds.), 2013. *Performance in Greek and Roman Theatre*. Leiden.
- Harrison, S.J. 2002. "Ovid and Genre: Evolutions of an Elegist", in P. Hardie (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid* (Cambridge) 79–94.
- Hartford, G.F. 1990. "T.S. Eliot on the Stoicism of Seneca", *English Studies in Africa* 33.1: 1–14.
- Hartung, J.A. 1844. *Euripides restitutus*, 2 vols. Hamburg.
- Hedrick, C.W. Jr. 2011. "Literature and Communication," in M. Peachin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World* (Oxford) 167–90.
- Heinze, T. 1991–1993. "The Authenticity of Ovid Heroides 12 reconsidered", *BICS* 38: 94–97.
- 2007. *P. Ovidius Naso. Der XII. Heroidenbrief: Medea an Jason. Mit einer Beilage: Die Fragmente der Tragödie Medea*. Leiden.
- Henderson, J. 1998. *Fighting For Rome: Poets and Caesars, History and Civil War*. Cambridge.
- 1999. *Writing Down Rome: Satire, Comedy, and Other Offenses in Latin Poetry*. Oxford.
- Henning, E. 1910. *De tragicorum Atticorum narrationibus*, Diss. Göttingen.
- Henrichs, A. 1993. "The Tomb of Aias and the Prospect of Hero Cult in Sophokles", *ClAnt* 12: 165–80.
- 1994–1995. "‘Why Should I Dance?': Choral Self-Referentiality in Greek Tragedy", *Arion* 3: 56–111.
- Henry, D. and Walker, B. 1983. "The *Oedipus* of Seneca: An Imperial Tragedy", in A.J. Boyle (ed.), *Seneca Tragicus. Ramus Essays on Senecan Drama* (Berwick) 128–39.
- Herington, C.J. 1961. "*Octavia Praetexta*: A Survey", *CQ* 11: 18–30.
- 1966. "Senecan Tragedy", *Arion* 5: 422–71.
- 1967. "Aeschylus in Sicily", *JHS* 87: 74–85.
- Hermant, J. 1995. "Kleists Penthesilea im Kreuzfeuer geschlechtsspezifischer Diskurse", *Monatshefte* 87: 34–47.
- Herrmann, L. (ed.), 21961. *Sénèque. Tragédies*. 2 vols. Paris.
- Hinds, S. 1993. "Medea in Ovid: Scenes from the Life of an Intertextual Heroine", *MD* 30: 9–47.
- Hofmann, J.B. and Szantyr, A. 21972. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. Munich.
- Holford-Strevens, L. 2000. "Sophocles at Rome", in J. Griffin (ed.), *Sophocles Revisited* (Oxford) 219–59.
- Holladay, C. 1989. *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors II*. Atlanta.
- Holland, L.L. 2007–2008. "Last act in Corinth: the burial of Medea's children (E. *Med.* 1378–83)", *CJ* 103: 407–30.

- Holmström, K.G. 1967. *Monodrama, Attitudes, Tableaux Vivants: studies on some trends of theatrical fashion 1770–1815*. Stockholm.
- Hose, M. 1998. "Anmerkungen zur Verwendung des Chores in der römischen Tragödie der Republik", in P. Riermer and B. Zimmermann (eds.), *Der Chor im antiken und modernen Drama* (Stuttgart) 113–38.
- 1999. "Post-Colonial Theory and Greek Literature at Rome", *GRBS* 40: 303–26.
- Houston, G. 2004. "How Did You Get Hold of a Book in a Roman Library? Three Second-Century Scenarios", *CW* 80.1: 5–13.
- Hross, H. 1958. *Die Klagen der verlassenen Heroiden in der lateinischen Dichtung*. Munich.
- Hughes, T. 1969. *Seneca's Oedipus*. London.
- Huys, M. 1996–1997. "Euripides and the 'Tales from Euripides': sources of the *Fabulae* of Ps.-Hyginus?", *APF* 42: 168–78 (part 1), 43: 11–30 (part 11).
- Iddeng, J.W. 2006. "*Publica aut Peri!* The Releasing and Distribution of Roman Books", *SO* 81: 58–84.
- Innocenti, B. 1994. "Towards a Theory of Vivid Description as Practiced in Cicero's *Verrine Orations*", *Rhetorica* 12: 355–81.
- Inwood, B. 1993. "Seneca and Psychological Dualism", in J. Brunschwig and M. Nussbaum (eds.), *Passions and Perceptions: Studies in Hellenistic Philosophy of Mind* (Cambridge) 150–83.
- 2000. "The Will in Seneca the Younger", *CP* 95: 44–60.
- Jacobson, H. 1968. "Ennian Influence in 'Heroides' 16 and 17", *Phoenix* 22: 299–03.
- 1983. *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Janka, M. 2004. "Senecas *Phaedra*: Des Dramas Kern und sein episch-elegischer Rahmen", in J. Fugmann, M. Janka, U. Schmitzer, H. Seng (eds.), *Theater, Theaterpraxis, Theaterkritik im kaiserzeitlichen Rom* (Munich) 25–57.
- Jay, P. 2010. *Global Matters: The Transnational Turn in Literary Studies*. Ithaca.
- Jewett, W. 1996. "Strange Flesh: Shelley and the performance of scepticism", *Texas Studies in Language and Literature* 321–39.
- Jocelyn, H.D. (ed.), 1967. *The Tragedies of Ennius: the Fragments*. Cambridge.
- 1969. "Chrysalus and the Fall of Troy", *HSCP* 73: 135–52.
- 1972. "Ennius as Dramatic Poet", in O. Skutsch (ed.), *Ennius: Sept Exposés Suivis de Discussions, Fondation Hardt Entretiens* (Geneva) 17: 41–95.
- 1973. "Greek poetry in Cicero's prose writings", *YCS* 23: 61–111.
- 2000. "Accius' *Aeneadae aut Decius*: Romans and the Gallic Other", in G. Manuwald (ed.), *Identität und Alterität in der frühromischen Tragödie* (Würzburg). 325–61.
- Johnson, W.A. 2004. *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*. Toronto.
- 2010. *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Reading Cultures*. Oxford.

- Johnson, W.A. and Holt, H.N. (eds.), 2009. *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*. Oxford.
- Jong, I.J.F. de. 1991. *Narrative in Drama. The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech*. Leiden.
- Jong, I.J.F. de & Nünlist, R. 2004. "From Bird's Eye View to Close-Up: The Standpoint of the Narrator in the Homeric Epics", in A. Bierl, A. Schmidt and A. Willi (eds.), *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung* (Berlin) 63–83.
- Jouteur, I. 2009. *La théâtralité dans l'œuvre ovidienne*. Nancy.
- Karakasis, E. 2005. *Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy*. Cambridge.
- Kaster, R.A. 2006. *Marcus Tullius Cicero. Speech on Behalf of Publius Sestius. Translated with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Katsouris, A.G. 2005. "Euripides' Archelaos: a reconsideration", in G. Bastianini and A. Casanova (eds.), *Euripide e i papyri* (Florence) 205–26.
- Keller, J. 1959. *Struktur und dramatische Funktion des Botenberichts bei Aischylos und Sophokles*, Diss. Tübingen.
- Kelly, A. 2009. *Sophocles: Oedipus at Colonus*. London.
- Kennedy, D. 2002. "Epistolarity: The *Heroides*", in P. Hardie (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid* (Cambridge) 217–32.
- Kennedy, R.F. 2013. "A Tale of Two Kings: Competing Aspects of Power in Aeschylus' *Persians*", in J. Collins and R. Rader (eds.), *New Approaches to Greek Drama, Ramus* 42: 64–88.
- Kenner, H. 1959. *The Invisible Poet: T.S. Eliot*. New York.
- Ker, J. 2009. *The Deaths of Seneca*. New York.
- Kerrigan, J. 1996. *Revenge Tragedy*. Oxford.
- Khair, T. 2001. *Babu Fictions: Alienation in Contemporary Indian English Novels*. Delhi.
- Kirichenko, A. 2013. *Lehrreiche Trugbilder. Senecas Tragödien und die Rhetorik des Sehens*. Heidelberg.
- von Kleist, H. 1988. "Penthesilea", in *Kleist: Five Plays*. M. Greenberg (tr.). New Haven.
- 1989. *On a theatre of marionettes*. G. Wilford (tr.). London.
- 1993a. "Über das Marionettentheater", in C. Hanser (ed.), *Heinrich von Kleist: Sämtliche Werke und Briefe*. Vol. 2 (Munich) 345.
- 1993b. "Penthesilea", in C. Hanser (ed.), *Heinrich von Kleist: Sämtliche Werke und Briefe*. Vol. 1 (Munich) 321–423.
- Kleve, K. 1990. "Ennius in Herculaneum", *CronErc* 20: 5–16.
- 1996. "How to read an illegible papyrus. Towards an edition of *PHerc. 78*, Caecilius Statius, *Obolostates sive Faenerator*", *CronHerc* 26: 5–14.
- 2001. "Caecilius Statius, The Money-lender (*PHerc. 78*)", in: I. Andorlini, G. Bastianini, M. Manfredi, and G. Menci (eds.), *Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia. Firenze, 23–29 agosto 1998*, 2 vols. (Firenze) 2–25.
- Klotz, A. (ed.), 1953. *Scaeniconum Romanorum Fragmenta*. vol. 1. Munich.

- Knox, P.E. 1986. "Ovid's Medea and the Authenticity of Heroides 12", *HSP* 90: 207–23.
- Kohn, T.D. 2003. "Who Wrote Seneca's Plays?", *CW* 96.3: 271–80.
- 2013. *The Dramaturgy of Senecan Tragedy*. Ann Arbor.
- Konstan, D. 2006. "The Active Reader in Classical Antiquity," *Argos: Revista de la Asociación Argentina de Estudios Clásicos* 30: 5–16.
- 2009. "The Active Reader and the Ancient Novel", in Michael Paschalis, Stelios Panayotakis, and Gareth Schmeling (eds.), *Readers and Writers in the Ancient Novel* (Groningen = *Ancient Narrative* supplement 12) 1–17.
- 2010. "Excerpting as a Reading Practice", in Gretchen Reydam-Schils (ed.), *Deciding Culture: Stobaeus' Collection of Excerpts of Ancient Greek Authors* (Turnhout) 9–22.
- Kovacs D. (ed.), 1995. *Euripides. Children of Heracles, Hippolytus, Andromache, Hecuba*. Cambridge.
- Kowalzig, B. 2006. "The Aetiology of Empire? Hero-Cult and Athenian Tragedy", in J. Davidson, F. Muecke and P. Wilson (eds.), *Greek Drama III: Essays in Honour of Kevin Lee* (London) 79–98.
- Kragelund, P. 1998. "Galba's 'Pietas,' Nero's Victims and the Mausoleum of Augustus", *Historia* 47.2: 152–73.
- 2002. "Historical Drama in Ancient Rome: Republican Flourishing and Imperial Decline?", *SO* 77: 5–51.
- 2005. "History, sex and scenography in the *Octavia*", *SO* 80: 68–114.
- Kroll, W. 1924. *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*. Stuttgart.
- Kubik, J. 1887. "De M. Tullii Ciceronis poetarum Latinorum studii", *Dissertationes philologae Vindobonenses* (Leipzig) 1: 239–348.
- Kugelmeier, C. 2007. *Die innere Vergegenwärtigung des Bühnenspiels in Senecas Tragödien*. Munich.
- 2014. "Seneca's Tragedies and the Theatres of their Time: Opportunities or Obstacles for Staging?", in J.-P. Aygon (ed.), *Sénèque, un philosophe homme de théâtre? (Table ronde internationale des 30–31 mars 2012, Musée d'art et d'histoire de Saint-Denis / ENS Ulm, Paris)*, *Pallas* 95: 59–81.
- La Penna, A. 1963. "Orazio, Augusto e la questione del teatro latino", in A. La Penna (ed.), *Orazio e l'ideologia del principato* (Turin) 148–62.
- 1972. "Atreo e Tieste Sulle Scene Romane", *Studi classici in onore di Quintino Cataudella* 1: 357–71.
- 1979. *Fra teatro, poesia e politica romana*. Turin.
- 2000. "Le *Sabinae* di Ennio e il tema della concordia nella tragedia arcaica latina", in G. Manuwald (ed.), *Identität und Alterität in der frühromischen Tragödie* (Würzburg) 241–54.
- La Rocca, E. 1977. "Note sulle importazioni greche in territorio laziale nell' VIII secolo a. C.", *PP* 32: 375–97.

- Lachmann, K. 1876. "De Ovidii epistulis", in J. Vahlen (ed.), *Kleinere Schriften zur klassischen Philologie* (Berlin) 56–61.
- Lada-Richards, I. 2003. "'Mobile statuary': refractions of pantomime dancing from Callistratus to Emma Hamilton and Andrew Ducrow", *IJCT* 10.1: 3–37.
- 2007. *Silent Eloquence. Lucian and Pantomime Dancing*. London.
- 2010. "Dead but not extinct: on reinventing pantomime dancing in eighteenth century England and France", in F. Macintosh (ed.), *The ancient dancer in the modern world* (Oxford) 19–38.
- Ladek, F. 1909. "Die römische Tragödie Octavia und die Elektra des Sophokles", *Wiener Eranos* 189–99.
- Lana, I. 1958–1959. "L'Atreo di Accio e la leggenda di Atreo e Tieste nel teatro tragico romano", *Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche*, AAT 93: 293–385.
- Landolfi, L. 1998. "Nescio quid certe mens mea maius agit (Her. XII, 212). Medea fra analessi e prolessi letteraria", *Pan* 15–16: 57–89.
- Lape, S. 2004. *Reproducing Athens: Menander's Comedy, Democratic Culture, and the Hellenistic City*. Princeton.
- Lausberg, H. 1990. *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*. Stuttgart.
- Leavell, L. 1985. "Nietzsche's Theory of Tragedy in the Plays of T.S. Eliot", *Twentieth Century Literature* 31.1: 111–26.
- Lebek, W.D. 1985. "Senecas Agamemnon in Pompeji (CIL IV 6698)", *ZPE* 59: 1–6.
- Lefevre, A. (ed.), 1977. *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig*. Assen.
- Lefèvre, E. 1966. "Schicksal und Selbstverschuldung in Senecas Agamemnon", *Hermes* 94: 482–96 [repr. in E. Lefèvre (ed.), 1972. *Senecas Tragödien* (Darmstadt) 457–76].
- 1973. "Die Schuld des Agamemnon. Das Schicksal des Troja-Siegers in stoischer Sicht", *Hermes* 101: 64–91.
- 1981. "A Cult without God or the unfreedom of freedom in Seneca tragicus", *CJ* 77: 32–36.
- 1990. "Die politisch-aitiologische Ideologie der Tragödien des Livius Andronicus", *QCTC* 8: 9–19.
- 2000. "Aitiologisch-politische Implikationen in Naevius' Danae", in G. Manuwald (ed.), *Identität und Alterität in der frühromischen Tragödie* (Würzburg) 175–84.
- 2001. "Ennius' Medea im römisch-politischen Kontext", in S. Faller (ed.), *Studien zu antiken Identitäten* (Würzburg) 39–51.
- 2002. "Diomedes und andere 'italische' Helden bei Accius", in S. Faller and G. Manuwald (eds.), *Accius und seine Zeit* (Würzburg) 187–97.
- 2006. *Plautus' Rudens*. Tübingen.
- Leigh, M. 1996. "Varius Rufus, Thyestes, and the Appetites of Antony", *PCPS* 42: 171–97.
- 1997. *Lucan: Spectacle and Engagement*. Oxford.

- 2004. *Comedy and the Rise of Rome*. Oxford.
- Lennartz, K. 1994. *Non verba sed vim. Kritisch-exegetische Untersuchungen zu den Fragmenten archaischer römischer Tragiker*. Stuttgart.
- Leo, F. 1878. *De Senecae tragoediis observationes criticae*. Berlin.
- ²1912. *Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie*. Berlin.
- Lessing, G. 1971. *Miss Sara Sampson: ein bürgerliches Trauerspiel*. Frankfurt.
- 1973. "Von den Lateinischen Trauerspielen welche unter dem Namen des Seneca bekannt sind", in M. Göpfert (ed.), *Lessing: Werke* (Munich) 4: 58–141.
- 1984. *Laocoön*. E.A. McCormick (tr.). Baltimore.
- Levene, D.S. 2010. *Livy on the Hannibalic War*. Oxford.
- Lewis, M. 2010. *Catullus' Poetics of Place: Structures of Geographical Reference in the Corpus*, Diss. Sydney.
- Liapis, V. 2013. "Staging Rhesus", in G.W.M. Harrison and V. Liapis (eds.), *Performance in Greek and Roman Theatre* (Leiden) 235–53.
- Liebermann, W.-L. 1974. *Studien zu Senecas Tragödien*. Meisenheim.
- Liedloff, K. 1884. *De tempestatibus, necyomanteae, inferorum descriptionibus, quae apud poetas Romanos primi p. Chr. saeculi leguntur*, Diss. Leipzig.
- 1902. *Die Nachbildung griechischer und römischer Muster in Senecas Troades und im Agamemnon*. Grimma.
- Lintott, A. 1994. "Political History, 146–95 BC", in J.A. Crook (ed.), *Cambridge Ancient History* 9: 40–103. Cambridge.
- Littlewood, C.A.J. 2004. *Self-Representation and Illusion in Senecan Tragedy*. Oxford.
- 2014. "Hercules Oetaeus", in A. Heil and G. Damschen (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Seneca: Philosopher and Dramatist* (Leiden) 515–20.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (tr.) 1994. *Sophocles, Oedipus Tyrannus*. Oxford.
- Lohikoski, K.K. 1966. "Der Parallelismus Mykene-Troja in Senecas *Agamemnon*", *Arctos*, n.s. 4: 63–70.
- Lomas, K. 1993. *Rome and the Western Greeks, 350 BC–AD 200: Conquest and Acculturation in Southern Italy*. London.
- Long, A.A. & Sedley, D. (eds.), 1987. *The Hellenistic Philosophers*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- Lucas, F.L. 1922. *Seneca and Elizabethan Tragedy*. Cambridge.
- Lundström, S. 1982. *Ein textkritisches Problem in den Tusculanen*. Uppsala.
- Lyndall G. 1999. *T.S. Eliot: An Imperfect Life*. New York.
- Macintosh, F. 2009. *Sophocles' Oedipus Tyrannus*. Cambridge.
- Mader, G. 1993. "Tyrant and Tyranny in Act III of Seneca's *Oedipus*", *GB* 19: 103–28.
- 1998. "Quod nolunt uelint: Deference and Doublespeak at Seneca, *Thyestes* 334–335", *CJ* 94: 31–47.
- 1993. "From sculpture to vase-painting: archaeological models for the actor" in *Grazer Beiträge: Zeitschrift für die klassische Altertumswissenschaft* 19, 103–28.
- Magno, P. 1977. *Marco Pacuvio*. Milan.

- Mallinson, J. 2002. *T.S. Eliot's Interpretation of F.H. Bradley*. Dordrecht.
- Manuwald, G. (ed.), 2000. *Identität und Alterität in der frühromischen Tragödie*. Würzburg.
- 2001. *Fabulae praetextae: Spuren einer literarischen Gattung der Römer*. Munich.
- 2003. *Pacuvius summus tragicus poeta. Zum dramatischen Profil seiner Tragödien*. Munich.
- 2010. *Roman Drama. A Reader*. London.
- 2011. *Roman Republican Theatre: A History*. Cambridge.
- 2012. *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta, 2: Ennius*. Göttingen.
- (ed.), 2012 *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*. Vol. 2: Ennius. Göttingen.
- 2013. "Oratory on the Stage in Republican Rome", in C. Kremmydas & K. Tempest (eds.), *Hellenistic Oratory: Continuity and Change* (Oxford) 277–94.
- Marchetta, A. 2010. *Vittima e Carnefice: l'ambiguità dei ruoli nel Thyestes di Seneca*. Rome.
- Marcia F. 1995. *Seneca's Phoenissae: Introduction and Commentary*. Leiden.
- Marcucci, S. 1994. "Per una interpretazione della morte di Agamemnone in Seneca", *SCO* 44: 191–203.
- 1996. *Modelli 'tragic' e modelli 'epici' nell'Agamemnon di L.A. Seneca*. Milan.
- Mariano, B.M. 1993. "Antonii Volsci expositiones in Heroidas Ovidii: alcuni appunti", *Aevum* 67: 105–12.
- Marincola, J. 2010. "The Rhetoric of History: Allusion, Intertextuality, and Exemplarity in Historiographical Speeches", in D. Pausch (ed.), *Funktionen von Reden in der antiken Historiographie* (Berlin) 259–90.
- Mariotti, S. 2000. "La carriera poetica di Ovidio", in S. Mariotti (ed.), *Scritti di filologia classica* (Rome) 123–53.
- Marmorale, E.V. (ed.), 1950. *Naevius poeta. Introduzione biobibliografica, testo dei frammenti e commento*. Florence.
- Marshall, C.W. 2002. "Comments on Kragelund", *SO* 77.1: 75–78.
- 2004. "Alcestis and the Ancient Rehearsal Process (*P. Oxy.* 4546)", *Arion* 11.3: 27–45.
- 2006. *The Stagecraft and Performance of Roman Comedy*. Cambridge.
- 2009. "Sophocles' Chryses and the Date of *Iphigenia in Tauris*", in J.R.C. Cousland and J.R. Hume (eds.), *The Play of Texts and Fragments: Essays in Honour of Martin Cropp* (Leiden) 141–56.
- 2013. "Three Actors in Old Comedy, Again", in G.W.M. Harrison and V. Liapis (eds.), *Performance in Greek and Roman Theatre* (Leiden) 257–78.
- 2014. "The Works of Seneca the Younger and Their Dates", in A. Heil and G. Damschen (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Seneca: Philosopher and Dramatist* (Leiden) 33–44.
- Marshall, D. 1988. *The Surprising Effects of Sympathy: Marivaux, Diderot, Rousseau and Mary Shelley*. Chicago.

- Marshall, G. 1998. *Actresses on the Victorian Stage: feminine performance and the Galatea myth*. Cambridge.
- Marti, B. 1945. "Seneca's Tragedies: A New Interpretation", *TAPA* 76: 216–45.
- Martindale, C. 1993. *Redeeming the Text*. Cambridge.
- Masson, J. 1708. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Vita*. Amsterdam.
- Mastrocinque, A. 1983–1984. "La cacciata di Tarquinio il Superbo. Tradizione romana e letteratura greca", *Athenaeum* 61: 475–80 and 62: 210–29.
- Matthews, S. 2013. *T.S. Eliot and Early Modern Literature*. Oxford.
- Mayer, R. 2001. *Tacitus: Dialogus de Oratoribus*. Cambridge.
- 2002. *Seneca: Phaedra*. London.
- 2002. "Reception and Later Influence", *Seneca: Phaedra* (London) 75–87.
- 2006. "Roman Tragedy", in E. Bispham, E. Harrison and B. Sparkes (eds.), *Edinburgh Companion to Ancient Greece and Rome* (Edinburgh) 295–98.
- Mazzoli, G. 1998. "Les prologues des tragédies de Sénèque", in M.-H. Garelli (ed.), *Rome et le tragique*, *Pallas* 49: 121–34.
- McNamee, K. 2010. "Reading Outside the Library", in S. Gurd (ed.), *Philology and Its Histories* (Columbus, OH) 20–46.
- Meier, C. 1988. *Die politische Kunst der griechischen Tragödie*. Munich.
- Messina, V. 1988. "Appunti sull'Atreus Acciano", *Dioniso* 58: 53–73.
- Michel, A. 1983. "Cicéron et la tragédie: les citations de poètes dans les livres II–IV des «Tusculanes»,", *Helmantica* 34: 443–54.
- Michellini, A.N. 1982. *Tradition and Dramatic Form in the 'Persians' of Aeschylus*. Leiden.
- Mignon, M. (tr.), 1935. *Sénèque Tragédies*. 2 vols. Paris.
- Millar, F. 1998. *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*. Ann Arbor.
- Miller, F.J. (tr.), 1961. *Seneca's Tragedies*, 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.
- 1916 [repr. 1984]. *Ovid Metamorphoses in Two Volumes*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Mills, S. 1997. *Theseus, Tragedy and the Athenian Empire*. Oxford.
- Miola, R. 1992. *Shakespeare and classical tragedy: the influence of Seneca*. Oxford.
- Mommsen, K. 1974. *Kleists Kampf mit Goethe*. Heidelberg.
- Monteleone, C. 1989. "L'Atreus di Accio e l'atto secondo del Thyestes di Seneca", *Maia* 41: 99–108.
- Moody, D.A. 1994. *Thomas Stearns Eliot, Poet*. Cambridge.
- Mooneeram, R. 2006. "Language Politics in Dev Virahsawmy's *Toufann*, a Postcolonial Rewriting of *The Tempest*", *Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 41: 67–81.
- Moore, T.J. 1998. *The Theater of Plautus: Playing to the Audience*. Austin.
- Morford, M.P.O. 1996. *The Poet Lucan. Studies in Rhetorical Epic*. Oxford. [repr. Bristol 1996].
- 2002. *The Roman Philosophers: From the Time of Cato the Censor to the Death of Marcus Aurelius*. London.

- Morstein-Marx, R. 2004. *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge.
- Most, G.W. (ed.), 1997. *Collecting Fragments—Fragmente sammeln*. Göttingen.
- 2003. "Euripide ὁ γνωμολογικώτατος", in M.S. Funghi (ed.), *Aspetti di letteratura gnomica nel mondo antico* (Florence) 1: 141–66.
- Motto, A.L. & Clark, J.R. 1988. "Fata mutata and fluctus varii in the *Agamemnon*", in A.L. Motto and J.R. Clark (eds.), *Senecan Tragedy* (Amsterdam) 163–214.
- Mukherjee, A. 2014. *What Is a Classic? Postcolonial Rewriting and Invention of the Canon*. Stanford.
- Muller, R. 2006. *Les Stoïciens, la liberté et l'ordre du monde*. Paris.
- Müller, G. 1953. "Senecas *Oedipus* als Drama", *Hermes* 81: 447–64 [repr. in E. Lefèvre (ed.), 1972. *Senecas Tragödien* (Darmstadt): 376–401].
- Müller, J-D. 2007. "Evidentia und Medialität. Zur Ausdifferenzierung von Evidenz in der Frühen Neuzeit", in G. Wimböck et al. (eds.), *Evidentia: Reichweiten visueller Wahrnehmung in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Berlin) 57–82.
- Müller, L. 1889. *De Pacuvii fabulis disputatio*. Berlin.
- Murphy, J.V. 1975. *The Dark Angel: gothic elements in Shelley's works*. Lewisburg.
- Nervegna, S. 2014. "Performing Classics: The Tragic Canon in the Fourth Century and Beyond", in E. Csapo, H.R. Goette, J.R. Green and P. Wilson (eds.), *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century BC* (Berlin) 157–87.
- Nietzsche, F. 1982. *Daybreak: Thoughts on the Prejudices of Morality*. R.J. Hollingdale (tr.). Cambridge.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. 1990. "The Dating of Seneca's Tragedies, with Special Reference to *Thyestes*", *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 6: 95–114.
- Norland, H. 2009. *Neoclassical tragedy in Elizabethan England*. Newark.
- Nussbaum, M. 1993. "Poetry and the Passions: Two Stoic Views", in J. Brunschwig and M. Nussbaum (eds.), *Passions and Perceptions: Studies in Hellenistic Philosophy of Mind* (Cambridge) 97–149.
- 2003. "Philosophy and Literature", in D. Sedley (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy* (Cambridge) 211–41.
- O'Gorman, E. 2009. "Intertextuality and Historiography", in A. Feldherr (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians* (Cambridge) 231–41.
- Oppel, E. 1968. *Ovids Heroides: Studien zur inneren Form und zur Motivation*. Nuremberg.
- Osann, F. 1816. *Analecta critica poesis Romanorum scaenicae reliquias illustrantia*. Berlin.
- Owens, W.M. 2011. "The Political Topicality of Menander's *Dyskolos*", *AJP* 132: 349–78.
- Paduano, G. 1988. "Sofocle, Seneca e la colpa di Edipo", *RFIC* 116: 298–317.
- (ed.), 1993. *Edipo*. Milan.
- Palmer, A. 1898. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides*. Oxford.
- Paratore, E. 1956. "La poesia nell'*Oedipus* di Seneca", *GIF* 9: 97–132.

- Paré-Rey, P. 2012. Flores et acumina. *Les sententiae dans les tragédies de Sénèque*. Lyon.
- (ed.), 2014a. *L'Aparté dans le théâtre antique* (Journées d'Étude organisées les 12–13 janvier 2012 à l'Université de Lyon 3). Paris.
- 2014b. "Poétique de l'aparté dans le théâtre de Sénèque", in P. Paré-Rey (ed.), *L'Aparté dans le théâtre antique* (Paris) 129–48.
- 2014c. "Les tragédies de Sénèque sont-elles spectaculaires? Réflexions sur quelques principes de composition", in J.-P. Aygon (ed.), *Sénèque, un philosophe homme de théâtre? (Table ronde internationale des 30–31 mars 2012, Musée d'art et d'histoire de Saint-Denis / ENS Ulm, Paris)*, *Pallas* 95: 33–57.
- Patterson, M. 1990. *The first German theatre: Schiller, Goethe, Kleist and Buchner in performance*. London.
- Peacock, R. 1977. "Eliot's Contribution to Criticism of Drama", in D. Newton-De Molina (ed.), *The Literary Criticism of T.S. Eliot* (London) 89–110.
- Pearson, L. (ed.) 1975. *Sophocles, Oedipus Tyrannus*. Oxford.
- Peglau, M. 2000. "virtutes und vitia in der älteren republikanischen Tragödie," in M. Braun et al. (eds.), *Moribus antiquis res stat Romana: Römische Werte und römische Literatur im 3. und 2. Jh. v. Chr* (Munich) 141–67.
- Pelling, C.B.R. 2000. *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian*. London.
- Pellucchi, T. 2008. "Il prologo della Medea come paradigma teatrale: il caso di Fedro IV 7", in G. Aricò and M. Rivoltella (eds.), *La riflessione sul teatro nella cultura romana* (Milan) 229–51.
- Perutelli, A. 2006. *Ulisse nella cultura Romana*. Florence.
- Petaccia, R. 1999. "Der griechische Mythos in der republikanischen Tragödie Roms: Aitiologische Tendenzen in Ennius' *Telephus*", in G. Vogt-Spira and B. Rommel (eds.), *Rezeption und Identität: Die kulturelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Griechenland als europäisches Paradigma* (Stuttgart) 155–68.
- Peterfreund, S. 1991. "Seduced by metonymy: figuration and authority in *The Cenci*", in G.K. Blank (ed.), *The New Shelley: later twentieth-century views* (Basingstoke) 184–203.
- Petrone, G. 1992. "Plauto e il vocabolario della filosofia", in P. Grimal (ed.), *La langue Latine, langue de la philosophie. Actes du colloque de Rome* (Rome) 51–57.
- 2000. "La praetexta repubblicana e il linguaggio della celebrazione", in G. Manuwald (ed.), *Identität und Alterität in der frühromischen Tragödie* (Würzburg) 113–21.
- 2001. "La praetexta repubblicana e la fondazione della memoria", *Cahiers du Groupe interdisciplinaire du théâtre antique* 14: 167–75.
- 2002. "L'Atreo di Accio e le passioni del potere", in S. Faller and G. Manuwald (eds.), *Accius und seine Zeit* (Würzburg) 245–53.
- Philips, J.J. 1986. "Atticus and the Publication of Cicero's Works", *CW* 79.4: 227–37.
- Philp, R.H. 1968. "Manuscript Tradition of Seneca's Tragedies", *CQ* n.s. 18: 150–79.

- Pierini, R.D. 2004. "La tragedia nelle *Tuscolane* di Cicerone tra esemplarità e terapia: riflessioni in margine agli *Inferi* a teatro", *Aevum* 4: 41–64.
- Pociña, A. 1984. *El tragediógrafo Lucio Accio*. Granada.
- Poe, J.P. 1983. "The Sinful Nature of the Protagonist of Seneca's *Oedipus*", in A.J. Boyle (ed.), *Seneca Tragicus. Ramus Essays on Senecan Drama* (Berwick) 140–58.
- Pohlenz, M. 1918. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanae disputationes*. Leipzig.
- Poli-Palladini, L. 2001. "Some reflections on Aeschylus' *Aetnae(ae)*", *RhM* 144: 287–325.
- Pound, E. 1934. *Make It New: Essays*. London.
- Powell, J. 1984. *Restoration theatre production*. London.
- Pratt, N.T. 1939. *Dramatic Suspense in Seneca and his Greek Predecessors*, Diss. Princeton.
- 1983. *Seneca's Drama*. Chapel Hill, NC.
- Puchner, M. 2010. *The Drama of Ideas: Platonic Provocations in Theater and Philosophy*. Oxford.
- Pyplacz, J. 2009. *The Aesthetics of Senecan Tragedy*. Krakow.
- Rainey, L. 2009. "Eliot's Poetics: Classicism and Histrionics", in E. Chinitz (ed.), *A Companion to T.S. Eliot* (Malden, Mass.) 301–10.
- Ramazani, J. 2009. *A Transnational Poetics*. Chicago.
- Ranger, P. 1991. "Terror and pity reigned in every breast": *Gothic drama in the London patent theatres 1750–1820*. London.
- Rawson, E. 1985a. "Theatrical Life in Republican Rome and Italy", *PBSR* 53: 97–113.
- 1985b. *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*. London.
- Reavis, S.A. 1978. *August Wilhelm Schlegels Auffassung der Tragödie im Zusammenhang mit seiner Poetik und ästhetischen Theorien seiner Zeit*. Frankfurt.
- Reed, T.J. 1980. *The Classical Centre: Goethe and Weimar 1775–1832*. Oxford.
- Reeve, W.C. 1993. *Kleist on stage, 1804–1897*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Revermann, M. 1999–2000. "Euripides, tragedy and Macedon: some conditions of reception", *ICS* 24–5: 451–67.
- 2006. *Comic Business: Theatricality, Dramatic Technique, and Performance Contexts of Aristophanic Comedy*. Oxford.
- Reynolds, L.D. (ed.), 1983. *Texts and Transmissions: A Survey of the Latin Classics*. Oxford.
- Rhodes, P.J. 2003. "Nothing to do with democracy: Athenian drama and the polis", *JHS* 123: 104–19.
- Ribbeck, O. (ed.), 1852. "Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta", *Tragicorum Romanorum fragmenta*. vol. 1 Leipzig.
- (ed.), 1855. "Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta", *Comicorum Romanorum praeter Plautum et Terentium fragmenta*. vol. 2. Leipzig.
- (ed.), 1871. "Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta", *Tragicorum Romanorum fragmenta*. vol. 1 Leipzig.
- (ed.), 1875. *Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik*. Leipzig.
- (ed.), 1897. *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*. Leipzig.

- Richter, S. 2005. "German classical tragedy: Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, Kleist, and Buchner", in R. Bushnell (ed.), *A Companion to Tragedy* (Oxford) 435–51.
- Riedel, V. 1996. "Lessings Verhältnis zur Antike: Grundzüge, historischer Stellenwert und aktuelle Bedeutung", *Jenaer Studien* 2: 83–98.
- Riemer, P. 1997. "Zur dramaturgischen Konzeption von Senecas *Agamemnon*", in B. Zimmermann (ed.), *Griechisch-römische Komödie und Tragödie* 11 (Stuttgart) 135–51.
- Rivoltella, M. 2008. "Parodia di un paradigma comportamentale eroico in Plaut. Amph. 252", in G. Aricò and M. Rivoltella (eds.), *La riflessione sul teatro nella cultura romana* (Milan) 5–14.
- Roller, D.W. 1996. "Euripides, Ennius, and Roman origins", *AncW* 27: 168–71.
- Ronconi, A. 1979. "Orazio e i poeti latini arcaici", in G. d'Anna (ed.), *Studi di poesia latina in onore di A. Traglia* (Rome) 2: 501–24.
- Rosenmeyer, T.G. 1989. *Senecan Drama and Stoic Cosmology*. Berkeley.
- Runchina, G. 1960. "Tecnica drammatica e retorica nelle tragedie di Seneca", *AFLC* 28: 163–324.
- Salamon, G. 2004. "Les citations dans les *Tusculanes*: quelques remarques sur les livres 1 et 2", in C. Darbo-Peschanski (ed.), *La citation dans l'Antiquité: actes du colloque du PARSIA Lyon, ENS LSH, 6–8 novembre 2002* (Grenoble) 135–46.
- 2006. "Les citations des philosophes dans le livre III des *Tusculanes*: forme et sens", in C. Nicolas (ed.), *Hôs ephat', dixerit quispiam = Comme disait l'autre—: mécanismes de la citation et de la mention dans les langues de l'Antiquité* (Grenoble) 69–79.
- Santorelli, P. 1980. "Accio: un emarginato consapevole?", *Vichiana* 9: 46–60.
- Sargent, J.L. 1997. *Ovid's Heroides: Libretti for Pantomime*. Bryn Mawr.
- Scafoglio, G. 2010. "Le 'sententiae' nella tragedia romana", *Philologia Antiqua* 3: 161–80.
- Schauer, M. 2012. *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta, 1: Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Tragicci Minores, Fragmenta adespota*. Göttingen.
- Schauer, M. (ed.), 2012. *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta, Vol I*. Göttingen.
- Schetter, W. 1968. "Die Prologszene zu Senecas *Oedipus*", *AU* 11: 23–49 [repr. with supplement in E. Lefèvre (ed.), 1972. *Senecas Tragödien* (Darmstadt): 402–49].
- Schierl, P. 2006. *Die Tragödien des Pacuvius. Ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten mit Einleitung, Text und Übersetzung*. Berlin.
- Schiesaro, A. 2003. *The Passions in Play: Thyestes and the Dynamics of Senecan Drama*. Cambridge.
- 2005. "Roman Tragedy", in R. Bushnell (ed.), *A Companion to Tragedy*. Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture (Oxford) 269–87.
- 2014. "Seneca's *Agamemnon*: the Entropy of Tragedy", in J.-P. Aygon (ed.), *Sénèque, un philosophe homme de théâtre? (Table ronde internationale des 30–31 mars 2012, Musée d'art et d'histoire de Saint-Denis / ENS Ulm, Paris)*, *Pallas* 95: 179–91.

- von Schiller, F. 1994. *Letters upon the Aesthetic Education of Man*. R. Snell (tr.). Bristol.
- Schindler, C. 2000. "Dramatisches Unwetter. Der Seesturm in Senecas *Agamemnon* (vv. 421–578)", in S. Gödde and T. Heinze (eds.), *Skenika. Beiträge zum antiken Theater und seiner Rezeption* (Darmstadt) 135–49.
- von Schlegel, A.W. 1846 [1815]. *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*. J. Black (tr.). London.
- Schmidt, E.A. 2000. "Aparte. Das dramatische Verfahren und Senecas Technik", *RhM* 143: 400–29.
- Schmidt, G.A. 2013. *Renaissance Hybrids: Culture and Genre in Early Modern England*. Farnham.
- Schmidt, P.L. 1985. "Die Poetisierung und Mythisierung der Geschichte in der Tragödie Octavia", *ANRW* II. 32.2: 1421–53.
- 2007. "Praetexta", in H. Cancik and H. Schneider (eds.), *Brill's New Pauly* (Leiden) 11: 770.
- Schmitz, C. 1993. *Die kosmische Dimension in den Tragödien Senecas*. Berlin.
- Schofield, M. 2013. "Writing Philosophy", in C. Steel (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero* (Cambridge) 73–87.
- Schubert, W. 2014. "Seneca the Dramatist", in A. Heil and G. Damschen (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Seneca: Philosopher and Dramatist* (Leiden) 73–93.
- Scivoletto, N. 1976. *Musa iocosa. Studio sulla poesia giovanile di Ovidio*. Rome.
- Scullion, S. 1999–2000. "Tradition and Invention in Euripidean Aitiology", *ICS* 24–25: 217–33.
- Seaford, R. 1994. *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-state*. Oxford.
- 2009. "Aitiologies of Cult in Euripides: A Response to Scott Scullion", in J.R.C. Cousland and J.R. Hume (eds.), *The Play of Texts and Fragments: Essays in Honour of Martin Cropp* (Leiden) 221–34.
- Sedgwick, W.B. 1927. "Parody in Plautus", *CQ* 21: 88–89.
- Segal, C. 1984. "Senecan Baroque: The Death of Hippolytus in Seneca, Ovid, and Euripides", *TAPA* 114: 311–25.
- 1968. *Roman Laughter. The Comedy of Plautus*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Seidensticker, B. 1969. *Die Gesprächsverdichtung in den Tragödien Senecas*. Heidelberg.
- 1985. "*Maius solito*: Senecas *Thyestes* und die tragoedia rhetorica", *A&A* 31: 116–36.
- Seminara, A.M. 2009. "Eschilo tra democrazia e tirannide: dai *Persiani* alle *Etnee*", *Sileno* 35: 69–86.
- Setaioli, A. 2014. "Free Will and Autonomy", in A. Heil and G. Damschen (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Seneca: Philosopher and Dramatist* (Leiden) 277–99.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. 1983. "Cicero and Early Latin Poetry", *ICS* 8: 239–49.

- Sharrock, A. 2009. *Reading Roman Comedy: Poetics and Playfulness in Plautus and Terence*. Cambridge.
- 2013. "Terence and Non-Comic Intertexts", in A. Augoustakis, A. Traill and J.E. Thorburn (eds.), *A Companion to Terence* (Malden, Mass) 52–68.
- Shelton, J.-A. 1978. *Seneca's Hercules Furens. Theme, Structure and Style*. Göttingen.
- 1983. "Revenge or Resignation: Seneca's *Agamemnon*", in A.J. Boyle (ed.), *Seneca Tragicus. Ramus Essays on Senecan Drama* [= *Ramus* 12] 159–83.
- Simpson, M. 1998. *Closet performances: political exhibition and prohibition in the dramas of Byron and Shelley*. Stanford.
- Sklenář, R.J. 2007–2008. "Seneca, *Oedipus* 980–94: How Stoic a Chorus?", *CJ* 103: 183–94.
- Slater, N.W. 1985. *Plautus in Performance: The Theatre of the Mind*. Princeton.
- 1992. "Plautine Negotiations: the *Poenulus* Prologue Unpacked", *YCS* 29: 131–46.
- 2000. "Religion and Identity in Pacuvius's *Chryses*", in G. Manuwald (ed.), *Identität und Alterität in der frühromischen Tragödie* (Würzburg) 315–23.
- Smith, J.A. 2003. "Flavian Drama: Looking Back with *Octavia*", in A.J. Boyle and W.J. Dominik (eds.), *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text* (Leiden) 391–430.
- Smolenaars, J.J.L. 1998. "The Vergilian Background of Seneca's *Thyestes* 641–682", *Vergilius* 44: 51–65.
- Snell, B. 1937. *Euripides Alexandros und andere Strassburger Papyri mit Fragmenten griechischer Dichter*. Berlin.
- Sonnenschein, E.A. 1914. "*Alcumena* Euripidi", *CR* 28: 40–41.
- Spahlinger, L. 2005. *Tulliana simplicitas. Zu Form und Funktion des Zitats in den philosophischen Dialogen Ciceros*. Göttingen.
- Spaltenstein, F. 2008. *Commentaire des fragments dramatiques de Livius Andronicus*. Brussels.
- 2014. *Commentaire des fragments dramatiques de Naevius*. Brussels.
- Spoth, F. 1992. *Ovids Heroides als Elegien*. Munich.
- Stabryla, S. 1970. *Latin Tragedy in Virgil's Poetry*. Wrocław.
- Stackmann, K. 1949. "Senecas *Agamemnon*. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Agamemnon-Stoffes nach Aischylos", *C&M* 10: 180–221.
- Staley, G.A. 2000. "'Like Monsters of the Deep': Seneca's Tragic *Monstra*", in S.K. Dickison and J.P. Hallett (eds.), *Rome and her Monuments: Essays on the City and Literature in Honor of Katherine A. Geffcken* (Wauconda, IL) 325–55.
- 2010. *Seneca and the Idea of Tragedy*. New York.
- 2014. "Making *Oedipus* Roman", in J.-P. Aygon (ed.), *Sénèque, un philosophe homme de théâtre?*, *Pallas* 95: 111–24.
- Stanley-Porter, D.-P. 1968. *Messenger-Scenes in Euripides*. Diss. London.
- Star, C. 2010. *The Empire of the Self: Self-Command and Political Speech in Seneca and Petronius*. Baltimore.

- Stärk, E. 1989. *Die Menaechmi des Plautus und kein griechisches Original*. Tübingen.
- Starr, R.J. 1987. "The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World", *CQ* 37: 213–23.
- 1990. "The Used-Book Trade in the Roman World", *Phoenix* 44.2: 148–57.
- Stockert, W. 2002. "Römisches in Accius' *Telephus*", in S. Faller and G. Manuwald (eds.), *Accius und seine Zeit (Würzburg)* 305–18.
- Strand, G. and Zimmermann, S. 1996. "Finding an audience: Beatrice Cenci, Percy Shelley, and the stage", *ERR* 6: 246–68.
- Stray, C. 1998. *Classics Transformed: schools, universities and society in England, 1830–1960*. Oxford.
- Suerbaum, W. (ed.), 2002. *Handbuch der Lateinischen Literatur der Antike. Erster Band. Die Archaische Literatur. Von den Anfängen bis Sullas Tod. Die vorliterarische Periode und die Zeit von 240 bis 78 v. Chr. HLL 1*. Munich.
- Sullivan, J.P. 1985. *Literature and Politics in the Age of Nero*. Ithaca.
- Sutton, D. 1986. *Seneca on the Stage*. Leiden.
- Syme, R. 1958. *Tacitus*. Oxford.
- Taplin, O. 1986. "Fifth-Century Tragedy and Comedy: A *Synkrisis*", *JHS* 106: 163–74.
- [1977] ²1989. *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus*. Oxford.
- [1978] ³1989. *Greek Tragedy in Action*. London.
- 2007. *Pots and Plays: Interactions between Tragedy and Greek Vase-Painting of the Fourth Century BC* Los Angeles.
- Tarrant, R.J. (ed.), 1976. *Seneca. Agamemnon*. Cambridge.
- 1978. "Senecan Drama and its Antecedents", *HSCP* 82: 213–63.
- (ed.), 1985. *Seneca's Thyestes*. Atlanta.
- 1995. "Greek and Roman in Seneca's Tragedies", in C.P. Jones, C.P. Segal, R.J. Tarrant and R.F. Thomas (eds.), *Greece in Rome. Influence, Integration, Resistance* (Cambridge, Mass.) 215–30 [= *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 97].
- 2002. "Comments on Kragelund", *SO* 77: 79–82.
- Thieme, J. 2001. *Postcolonial Con-texts: Writing Back to the Canon*. London.
- Thiong'o, N. 1986. *Decolonising the Mind: the Politics of Language in African Literature*. London.
- Thomas, R.F. 1999. *Reading Virgil and his Texts. Studies in Intertextuality*. Michigan.
- Thumiger, C. 2009. "On ancient and modern (meta) theatres: definitions and practices", *MD* 63: 9–58.
- Tietze Larson, V. 1988. "Seneca's Tragic Description: A 'Point of View'", *EMC* 32: 23–49.
- 1989. "Seneca's Epic Theatre", in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History v* (Brussels) 279–304.
- 1994. *The Role of Description in Senecan Tragedy*. Frankfurt.
- Timpanaro, S. 1988. *Cicerone. Della divinazione*. Milan.

- 1996. "Dall'Alexandros di Euripide all'Alexander di Ennio", *RFIC* 124: 5–70.
- Tischer, U. and Bitternagel, A. (eds.), 2010. *Fremde Rede—Eigene Rede. Zitieren und verwandte Strategien in antiker Prosa*. Frankfurt.
- Töchterle, K. (ed.), 1994. *Lucius Annaeus Seneca. Oedipus*. Komm. mit Einl., Text und Übers. Heidelberg.
- Torrance, I. 2013. *Metapoetry in Euripides*. Oxford.
- Touchette, L.A. 2000. "‘Sir William Hamilton’s ‘pantomime mistress’: Emma Hamilton and her Attitudes’" in C. Hornsby (ed.), *The impact of Italy: the Grand Tour and beyond* (London) 123–46.
- Traglia, A. (ed.), 1986. *Poeti latini arcaici. Volume primo. Livio Andronico, Nevio, Ennio*. Turin.
- Traina, A. 1970. *Vortit barbare: Le traduzioni poetiche da Livio Andronico a Cicerone*. Rome.
- 1986. "Allusività catulliana (due note al c. 64)", in A. Traina (ed.), *Poeti latini (e neolatini)* (Bologne) 1: 131–58.
- Trinacty, C.V. 2014. *Senecan Tragedy and the Reception of Augustan Poetry*. Oxford.
- Tronchet, G. 2009. "Hosidius le tragique et ses modèles ovidiens", in I. Jouteur (ed.), *La théâtralité dans l'œuvre ovidienne* (Nancy) 89–137.
- Vahlen, I. (ed.), 1903. *Ennianae poesis reliquiae*, iteratis curis recensuit. Leipzig.
- Valsa, M. 1957. *Pacuvius, poète tragique*. Paris.
- Van der Paardt, R. 1982. "‘Een bevlogen Nederlandse herdidichting’: Seneca’s *Phaedra* in de Bewerking van Hugo Claus", *Antieke Motieven in de moderne Nederlandse Letterkunde* (Amsterdam) 78–109.
- 1991. "Wolken van Kwaad", *Mythe en metafore* (Amsterdam) 147–63.
- 1991. *Mythe en metafore*. Amsterdam.
- 1992. "Als twee minnaars: Inleiding tot *Thyestes* van Hugo Claus", in R. van der Paardt and F. Decreus (eds.), *Dodelijke dikke Wolken* (Leiden) 18: 9–22.
- Varner, E.R. 2000. "Grotesque Vision: Seneca’s Tragedies and Neronian Art", in G.W.M. Harrison (ed.), *Seneca in Performance* (Swansea) 119–36.
- Venini, P. 1954. "Sui Niptra di Pacuvio", *RIL* 87: 175–87.
- Venuti, L. 1995. *The Translator’s Invisibility. A History of Translation*. London.
- 1998. *The Scandals of Translation. Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London.
- Vernant, J.P. and Vidal-Naquet, P. 1986. *Mythe et tragédie en Grèce ancienne*. Paris.
- Vickers, M. 2008. *Sophocles and Alcibiades: Athenian Politics in Ancient Greek Literature*. Ithaca.
- Videau, A. 2009. "La théâtralisation des Amours élégiaques d’Ovide, entre héroï-comique et burlesque", in I. Jouteur (ed.), *La théâtralité dans l'œuvre ovidienne* (Nancy) 173–86.

- Virmaux, O. 1975. *Le Théâtre et son Double*. Paris.
- Walde, C. 1992. *Hercules Labor: Studien zum pseudosenecanischen Hercules Oetaus*. Frankfurt.
- Warmington, E.H. (ed.), 1936–1940. *Remains of Old Latin*, 4 volumes. London.
- Watling, E.F. 1966. *Seneca: Four Tragedies and Octavia*. Harmondsworth.
- Webb, R. 2009. *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*. Farnham.
- Weber, E. 2000. “Die ältere Tragödie in Rom und die Legende von der trojanischen Abstammung”, in G. Manuwald (ed.), *Identität und Alterität in der frühromischen Tragödie* (Würzburg) 135–41.
- Weil, H. 1897. *Études sur le drame antique*. Paris.
- Wessels, A. 2014. *Ästhetisierung und ästhetische Erfahrung von Gewalt. Eine Untersuchung zu Senecas Tragödien*. Heidelberg.
- White, N.I. 1966. *The unextinguished hearth: Shelley and his contemporary critics*. New York.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2001. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: the Politics of Imitation*. Oxford.
- Wigodsky, M. 1972. *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry*. Wiesbaden.
- Wildberger, J. 2006. *Seneca und die Stoa. Der Platz des Menschen in der Welt*. Berlin.
- Wildemeersch, G. 2009. “Hugo Claus et le Surréalisme”, *nord, revue de critique et de création littéraires* 54: 51–68.
- Wilkinson, L.P. 1955. *Ovid recalled*. Cambridge.
- Williams, G.D. 2012. *The Cosmic Viewpoint: A Study of Seneca's Natural Questions*. Oxford.
- Williams, S. 1985. *German actors of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: Idealism, Romanticism and Realism*. Westport.
- Wilson, E. 1931. *Axel's Castle*. New York.
- Wilson, M. 2003. “Introduction: The Importance of *Octavia*”, in M. Wilson (ed.), *The Tragedy of Nero's Wife: Studies on the Octavia Praetexta*, *Prudentia* 35.1: 1–12.
- 2007. “Rhetoric and the Younger Seneca”, in W.J. Dominik and J. Hall (eds.), *Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Malden, Mass.) 425–38.
- Winckelmann, J.J. 1972 [1755]. “On the painting and sculpture of the Greeks”, in D. Irwin (ed.), *Winckelmann: writings on art* (London) 2–46.
- 2006 [1764]. *History of the Art of Antiquity*. A. Potts and H.F. Mallgrave (trs.). Los Angeles.
- Winsbury, R. 2009. *The Roman Book*. London.
- Winter, K. 2014. *Artificia mali. Das Böse als Kunstwerk in Senecas Rachetragödien*. Heidelberg.
- Wise, J. 2008. “Tragedy as ‘an augury of a happy life’”, *Arethusa* 41: 381–10.
- Wiseman, T.P. 1998. *Roman Drama and Roman History*. Exeter.

- 2000. "Liber: myth, drama and ideology in Republican Rome", in: C. Bruun, (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic: Politics, religion and historiography c. 400–133 BC* (Rome) 265–99.
- 2001. *The Principal Thing* (Presidential Address to the Classical Association). Sherborne.
- 2002a. "Praetexta, Togata and Other Unhelpful Categories (comments on Kragelund)", *SO* 77.1: 82–88.
- 2002b. "Review of Manuwald 2001", *BMCR* 6.13.
- Worton, M. 1982. "Speech and silence in *The Cenci*", in M. Allott (ed.), *Essays on Shelley* (Liverpool) 105–24.
- Wright, F.W. 1931. *Cicero and the Theater*. Northampton, Mass.
- Wright, M. 2005. *Euripides' Escape Tragedies: A Study of Helen, Andromeda, and Iphigenia among the Taurians*. Oxford.
- Wuelfing von Martitz, P. 1972. "Ennius als hellenistischer Dichter", in O. Skutsch (ed.), *Ennius* (Geneva) 253–89.
- Yakobson, A. 1999. *Elections and Electioneering in Rome: A Study in the Political System of the Late Republic*. Stuttgart.
- Young, R. 1995. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*. London.
- Zamir, T. 2007. *Double Vision: Moral Philosophy and Shakespearean Drama*. Princeton.
- Zanobi, A. 2008. "The Influence of Pantomime on Seneca's Tragedies", in E. Hall and R. Wyles (eds.), *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime* (Oxford) 227–57.
- 2010. "Seneca and Pantomime", in I. Gildenhard and M. Revermann (eds.), *Beyond the Fifth Century. Interactions with Greek Tragedy from the Fourth Century BCE to the Middle Ages* (Berlin) 269–88.
- 2014. *Seneca's Tragedies and the Aesthetics of Pantomime*. London.
- Zehnacker, H. 1981. *Théâtre et Spectacles dans l'Antiquité (Actes du colloque de Strasbourg, 5–7 novembre 1981)*. Leiden.
- Zeitlin, F.I. 1990. "Thebes: Theater of Self and Society in Athenian Drama", in J.J. Winkler and F.I. Zeitlin, (eds.), *Nothing to do with Dionysus?* (Princeton) 130–67 [= J.P. Euben (ed.), 1986. *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory* (Berkeley) 101–41].
- 1993. "The Artful Eye: Vision, Ecphrasis and Spectacle in Euripidean Theatre", in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge) 138–96.
- Zetzel, J.E.G. 1983. "Catullus, Ennius and the Poetics of Allusion", *JCS* 8: 251–66.
- 2007. "The Influence of Cicero on Ennius", in W. Fitzgerald and E. Gowers (eds.), *Ennius Perennis. The Annals and Beyond* (Cambridge) 1–16.
- Zillinger, W. 1911. *Cicero und die altrömischen Dichter*. Würzburg.

- Zimmermann, B. 1990. "Seneca und der Pantomimus", in G. Vogt-Spira (ed.), *Strukturen der Mündlichkeit in der römischen Literatur* (Tübingen) 161–67 [repr. 2008 as "Seneca and Pantomime", in E. Hall and R. Wyles (eds.), *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime* (Oxford) 218–26].
- 2000. "Laudes Atheniensium in der römischen Tragödie der republikanischen Zeit? Überlegungen zu Ennius, Erechtheus und Eumenides", in G. Manuwald (ed.), *Identität und Alterität in der frühromischen Tragödie* (Würzburg) 227–84.
- 2004. "Euripides' und Goethes Iphigenie", in O. Hildebrand & T. Pittrof (eds.), *"Auf klassischem Boden begeistert": Antike Rezeption in den deutschen Literatur* (Freiburg) 133–43.
- Zoellner, F. 1892. *Analecta Ovidiana*. Leipzig.
- Zorzetti, N. 1980. *La pretesta e il teatro latino arcaico*. Naples.
- 1990. "Tragici Latini", *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* (Rome) 5: 245–47.
- 1991. "Poetry and Ancient City: The Case of Rome", *CJ* 86: 311–29.
- Zwierlein, O. 1966. *Die Rezitationsdramen Senecas*, Meisenheim.
- 1983. *Prolegomena zu einer kritischer Ausgabe der Tragödien Senecas*. Wiesbaden.
- 1986. *L. Annaei Senecae: Tragoediae*. Oxford.

General Index

Note. Adjectives (e.g. demonic) are subsumed under nouns (e.g. demons)

- Absyrtus 208
 Achaean War 122
 Achaeans 12, 192, 287
 Achelous 144
 Acherusia 18
 Achilles 43, 136, 139, 152, 187, 242, 248, 288, 319, 321
 acrobats 370
 Actaeon 37, 273–74, 319
 Actium 236
 actors. *see also* performers 4, 12–13, 40–41, 44, 69, 73, 80, 85, 94–95, 99, 102, 147, 171, 223, 237, 239, 254, 260, 286, 288, 292, 303–304, 316–17, 323, 336, 355, 367, 371, 374–76, 380–82, 386
 adaptation 20, 221, 231, 283, 315, 319, 330–32, 330–47
 adultery 119, 156, 159, 161, 265
 Aeacus 306–307
 Aegeus 24
 Aegisthus 248, 268–69
 Aelia Restituta, Anna 379
 Aemilius Ballator 371
 Aemilius Paullus 216, 239
 Aemilius Scaurus 38, 148, 383
 Aeneas 31, 131, 147, 188–89, 225
 Aerope 159, 161
 Aesopus (actor) 10, 13, 237
 aetiology 70, 81–82, 86–87, 216–17, 224, 232
 Aetolia 144–45, 229, 291
 Aezani (Turkey) 373
 Africa 76, 371, 373
 Agamemnon 41–42, 80–81, 93, 101–102, 119, 121, 133, 143, 154, 161, 177–78, 193–94, 232, 234, 267–68
 Agrippina (mother of Nero) 384
 Ajax (Oileus) 177–79, 186–88, 192–94
 Ajax (Salaminus) 81, 87, 95, 296
 Albanum
 Villa of Domitian 380, 384
 Alcibiades 65
 Alcmena 145
 Alexander of Aphrodisias 272
 Alexander (Macedonian) 383
 Alexander (Paris) 78, 210
 Algeria 368, 369, 371
 alienation 83, 175, 194
 altar 125, 188, 193, 234, 266
 alterity 75, 77, 83–84
 Amazon 319, 321
 Amazonomachy 385
 amphitheatre 41–44, 370, 375, 382
 Amphytrion/Amphytruo 134, 180, 264–65, 287, 292, 304, 315
 anagnoresis. *see also* recognition 81
 anapestic quaternarii 54
 anapests 223
 Anaxenor (citharoide) 380
 Andromache 16, 77–78, 124–26, 135–35, 139–41, 149, 264, 267
 Andromeda 29, 31, 200
 anger 33, 111–12, 114, 130, 149, 173, 187, 203, 247–48, 250–51, 257, 276, 358
 Antiphilus
 Cadmus and Europa 383
 Antony 155, 257, 259
 Apamea (Syria) 380
 Aphrodite. *see also* Venus 380
 Aper, Marcus 101, 233
 Aphrodisias 272, 372–73, 382
 Apollo. *see also* Phoebus 7–10, 80, 83, 108–109, 113–14, 116–17, 129–31, 211, 273, 281, 302–304, 381
 Apollo Belvedere 314
 Apollonius of Rhodes 110
aposiopesis 209
 apostrophe 181, 206, 251, 295
apotheosis. *see also* divinization 106, 114, 255
 Aquilo 185
 Aquitania 372
 Arcadia 110
 Arcadians 107, 157
 Archelaus 71
 Arcturus 288–90
arena 42–43, 253, 369, 372, 374–75

- Arethusa 202
 Argive 12, 84, 123, 157, 162–63, 204
 Argo 24–25, 29–33, 37, 39–40, 43–44, 110, 204–205
 Argos (*polis*) 33, 43, 152, 158, 193, 239, 374
 Ariadne 145
 Armenia 143
 Artaud, Antonin 311, 331–33
 Artemis. *see also* Diana 319, 383
 aside 140, 268–69, 278, 344
 Asinius Pollio 46
 assassination 166, 193, 237, 257, 311, 325
 Astyanax 39, 121, 126–27, 135, 138–41, 143, 248
 Atellan 9, 63, 368, 370
 Athamas 18
 Atlas 107, 110, 113, 117, 157
 Ares. *see also* Mars 157
 Astyanax 39, 121, 126–27, 135, 138–41, 143, 248
 Athena 109, 177–79, 187–88, 192, 384
 Athens 17, 51, 67–68, 70, 82–83, 85–86, 88, 118, 137–38, 142, 180, 238–39, 287, 294–95, 314, 356, 372, 378, 381, 383
 Colonus 83, 87
 Theatre of Dionysus 83, 86, 372, 385
 Atossa 231
 Atreus 115, 134, 155–63, 165–67, 171, 181, 213, 225, 231, 234, 241, 246–59, 262–63, 265, 268, 282, 307, 315, 324, 334–38, 352, 355, 386
 Attic 65–70, 74, 79, 81–88, 171, 174, 176, 228, 230, 234, 260, 295
 Atticus (correspondent of Cicero) 46, 99
 audience. *see also* spectators 14, 25–26, 35, 38–44, 55, 59, 61, 67, 69–70, 73, 75, 77, 79–86, 94–95, 97–98, 101, 123, 125, 132, 137–38, 140, 146–49, 151, 153, 172, 174–75, 181–86, 188–95, 198, 225, 228, 231, 235–37, 244, 252–53, 255, 257, 268–69, 281, 283, 287–94, 297, 317, 321, 327, 334, 336, 341, 347, 350, 355, 359, 362, 367–71, 374–76, 378, 381–82, 384–86
 Augustan poetry/Rome 197, 202, 220–21, 285, 372
 Augustus. *see also* Octavian and author
 index 95–96, 103, 134, 201, 236, 256, 379, 381, 384
 Aulus Crispus, P. 380
 Aurelianus of Panormus 371
 Aurora. *see also* Dawn 361
 Auster 25, 185, 298
 Bacchus. *see also* Dionysus, Bromius 17–18, 116–17, 199, 302
 bacchant 18, 302
 Baiae 374–75
 barbarians 81, 84, 86, 124
 Barcelona 373
 baths 254, 353, 369
 Baudelaire 357
 Bauli 375
 bear baiting 373
 beasts/beast hunts 33, 36, 107, 111–12, 114–17, 191, 368, 370–71, 373, 379, 382, 384
 Belgium 330
 Berlin 320
 blocking 317
 Boethius 229
boni. *see also optimates* 157, 291
 Boreas 185
 Borges
 Pierre Menard, Author of the Quixote 69
 Bostra (Syria) 378
boule 379
 boxers 368, 373
 Brecht 175, 194–95
 Brindisium 243
 Briseis 200
 Britain 354, 372
 Britannicus 167
 Bromia 292–93
 Bromius. *see also* Bacchus, Dionysus 17–18, 302
 Browning, Robert 350
 Brussels 333
 Brutus. *see* Junius
 Bruttium 162
 Bulla Regia 373
 Burrus 143
 Cadiz 378
 Cadmus 209, 383
 Caere 383, 385
 Calama (Tunisia) 379, 384
 Calatorius 384
 Caliban 72
 Caligula 155, 164–66, 258–59

- Campania 118
 cannibal 209, 252, 328, 334, 350, 352
 Capherean 177
 Carneades 239
 Carthage 31, 151, 238, 381
 Casina (*puella*) 293
 Cassandra 68, 129–30, 141, 188, 193, 213, 268
 Cassius Dio 103, 254
catabasis 190
 Catana 374, 385
 Cato maior 1, 238–39
 Cato minor 100, 155, 216, 233, 236, 254
 Catulus 11–12
celsitudo 285, 308
 Cerberus 105, 110, 180, 189–91
 Cervantes
 Don Quixote 69
 Cetus 29–31, 34, 38
 Chaerea 306
 Chapman 360–62
 Bussy D'Ambois 360
 Charinus 294–300
 chariot 25, 28, 33, 35–36, 125, 276, 299,
 303–304, 361
 charioteer 42
 China 162
 choral reconciliation 144–45
choreia 84
 choreuts 84
 chorus, choral 38, 54, 64, 76, 84, 94, 102,
 118–19, 128, 132–38, 141, 143–46, 148–50,
 156, 161–62, 167, 171–73, 177, 181, 183, 224,
 226, 233, 235, 247, 255, 261, 265–66, 268,
 273–77, 315, 334–43, 352, 361, 376
 Christ 338, 342, 346, 356, 363
 Chrysalus 305
 Chryse (place) 80–81
 Chryses (king) 80–81, 84, 154
 Chryseis (Homeric hero) 80, 154
 Chrysippus 244, 247, 358
 Cicero, Quintus 46
 Circe 49
circus 42–44, 143
 Cirta 368, 371
 citharoide 380
 Claudia Quinta 216, 226, 232
 Claudian 138, 143, 151, 167, 234, 372, 374
 Claudius 132, 234, 249, 256, 372, 374, 383–84
 Claus, Hugo 330–47
 Oedipode 330–31, 333, 335, 339–44
 Phaedra 330–31, 333, 342–46
 Thyestes 330, 332–39, 343
 Cleopatra 142
 closet drama 218, 318, 322–23, 328, 350, 367
 Clytemnestra 41–42, 119, 193, 232, 246, 248,
 263, 268–69, 303
collegia 378–80, 384
 copper beaters 378
 dyers 379
 jewelers 378
 parasites of Dionysus 380
 victorious artists 380
 wine skin makers 378
 comedy. see also *togatae* 46, 60, 64, 66,
 68, 80, 82, 84–85, 94, 140, 146, 219–21,
 241, 283–308, 318, 350, 353, 381–82,
 385
 conflation. see also hybrid 321
 Corinth 28–29, 115, 203, 270–71, 273, 276–77,
 281
 Isthmus 115
 Corneille 334
 Corsica 132
 Corus 185
 cosmic dissolution 135, 145
cosmos 105
 costumes 288, 291, 367, 382–83
 Cotta 246
 Covent Garden 322–23
 Coward, Noel 349
 crab (astrology) 113, 115
 Crassus 371
 Crébillon
 Atrée et Thyeste 315
 Creon (Jason myth) 145, 267, 269, 277, 279,
 333, 340
 Critolaus 239
 cue 43–44, 59, 102, 260–82
 cult 82, 87, 152, 370, 379, 384, 387
 Cupid 296–97
 curse 249, 301, 324, 336, 340, 344–45
 Cybele 83
 Cylindrus 300
 Cynoscephalae 88
 Cyprus 295, 299–300, 373
 Czech 75

- Danaë 87, 225, 306
 dance 154, 172–73, 341, 370
 dancer 173, 183, 318
 Dante 354
 Daphnae (Turkey) 375
 Darius 231
 Dawn 185, 189, 361
 Death 107, 110
 death 19–20, 24, 28, 34–35, 37–38, 41–44,
 49–50, 95, 102–103, 110, 127, 133–37,
 140–46, 166, 171–72, 176–77, 179, 186–88,
 190–91, 193–94, 196, 212, 230, 235–36,
 240, 242, 245, 248–49, 254–55, 257, 274,
 279, 296, 311–29, 341–42, 345, 348, 352,
 360–63, 373
 Decius Mus 216, 220, 222, 230, 236
 declamation 105–17, 182
 deconstruct 71, 74
decuriones 369, 371, 378
 Deianira 144–45, 255
 Deiphobus 122, 213
 demons 183, 190
 Demophon 83
 Derventum 372
 destruction 118–31, 178, 186, 193, 212, 250,
 340, 346
dei ex machina 224
devotio 216, 230
 dialogue 46, 48, 50, 73, 80, 94, 99, 181–82,
 224, 236, 250, 255–58, 261–66, 268–70,
 277–80, 305, 318, 335, 339–40, 342–43,
 345, 354
 Diana. see also Artemis 206, 262, 319, 343
didaskalia 76, 137
 Dido 31
 Diogenes of Babylon 239
 Diogenes Laertius 247
 Diomedes (Homeric hero) 87, 117, 122, 245
 Diomedes (grammarian) 219–21
 Dionysia 66, 69, 82–83
 Dionysus. see also Bacchus, Bromius 83, 86,
 109, 238–39, 319, 372, 380 385
 Diphilus 289, 380
 Dis 189
 dismemberment 31, 35–36, 38, 181, 193, 319
 divination 181, 340
 divinization 105–106, 255–56
 Dodona 372
 Domitian 143, 371, 380, 384
 Donne 357
 Dorian 69–70
 Doris (in *Sweeney Agonistes*) 351–53
 doxographical 51
 dream 131, 139, 205, 210–13, 230–31
 Drusus the Elder 383
 Dryden 323
Essay of Dramatic Poetry 198
 Dusty (in *Sweeney Agonsites*) 351–53
 Dutch 330
 Easter 342
ecphrasis 180, 182, 189, 326, 328
 Edwardian 386
 egalitarianism 153
eisodos 85
 elegy 196–215
 Eliot, T.S. 331, 348–63
Daybreak 356
The Family Reunion 349
*Knowledge and Experience in the
 Philosophy of F.H. Bradley* 354
Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock 349
Murder in the Cathedral 349
On Poetry and Poets 359–60
Selected Essays 348–59, 362
Sweeney Agonistes 350–53, 359
*The Use of Poetry and the Use of
 Criticism* 361
The Waste Land 349–50
 Elizabethans 331–32, 337, 348–51, 354–55,
 357
enargeia 59, 174, 179, 182, 194
 enjambment 22, 186
 entrances 260–82
ephebes 138, 370
 Ephesus 373, 382–83
 Temple to Artemis 383
 epic 24, 28, 31, 38–39, 41, 43, 49, 64, 110, 151,
 171–95, 200, 203, 222–23, 241, 251, 303,
 334
 Epicurus 51, 239, 242, 245
 Epidamnus 301
 epilogue 291
 epiphany 379, 386
erotes 373
 erotic 202, 319, 343

- Erythea 114
 Erythrac 372
 ethopoia 202, 308
 Etruscan 63
 Euboea 177
 Euclio 293
 eunuch 306
 Europa 31, 383
 Eurybates 177–79, 184–88, 192–94, 268
 Euryplus 51
 Eurysaces 13–14, 81
 Eurystheus 108, 114
 Eutychus 297–300
 Evander 157
 execution 42, 108, 155, 164, 326, 368–70, 376, 380
exemplum virtutis. see also virtue 54–55, 58, 61; 230, 236
 exile 12, 35, 122, 124, 132, 146, 156, 201, 207, 233, 249, 289, 295, 297, 299–300
exodium 368, 370–71
exodus 57
extispicium 163, 358

fabula praetexta. see *praetexta* and historical drama
 Faesulae 385
 farce 368, 370–71, 380
 fate 135, 137, 155, 177, 179, 190, 194, 274–75, 287, 308, 341
 Fates 280, 352
 fear 19, 26, 33, 35–36, 38, 40, 53, 107, 109, 113, 126, 130–31, 133, 135, 139–41, 144–46, 155, 164–65, 178, 181, 187, 207, 212, 233, 241, 247, 26–59, 271–75, 277, 280, 282, 293, 296, 307, 336, 339, 343–44, 360, 386
 Festival of Roses (euphemism) 319
 festivals 83, 137, 196, 238, 283, 287, 367, 379
 fireworks 370
 fish breeding 374–75
Flaminica Augustorum 379
 Flamininus 88
 Flavian 118, 218, 372, 375
 fleet (Greek) 123, 130, 136, 171, 176–78, 184, 192, 194, 213, 268, 287
 Flemish 330, 332, 342, 346
fortuna adversa. see also reversal of fortune 57–58, 60–61, 147, 165, 187, 192, 194
 Fortuna 58, 229, 234, 244–45, 254, 271
 fortune 12, 53, 57, 284
 France 330
 frescoes 118, 383
 Fronto 242, 376
 Fulvius Nobilior 88, 216, 370
 Furies 120, 350, 358–59
 Furius Dionysius Philocalus 369

 Galba 381
 games. see also *ludus* 11, 41, 82, 196, 238, 367, 379, 381
 Garnier, Robert
 Hippolyte 344
 Gassman, Vittorio (prod.)
 Thyestes [of Seneca] 332
 Gauls 216
 German 75, 312, 314, 316, 334, 355
 Germany 314, 330, 354
 Geryon 114
 Giants 115
 Gibraltar 115
 Gigantomachy 385
 gladiator 42, 143, 368–71, 373, 381–84
 gladiatorial games. see also *munus gladiatorium* 196, 369, 375, 379
 Glauke 145
 Goethe 73, 314, 316–20, 354
 Faust 318
 Iphigenie 316–17, 319
 1.1.12: 317
 Rules for Actors 317
 Golden Fleece 160, 204–205, 209, 335–36
 Gorgon 114, 116–17
 Gortyn 374–75
 Gothic melodrama 311, 322–23, 325
 Gracchi 88, 163, 225
 Graces 381, 385
 graffiti 101–102, 118, 143, 382
 Great Britain 354
 Greekness 65–66, 77, 83, 85, 89
 Greneway (tr.)
 Annals [of Tacitus] 362
 Gripus 241

 Hades 105, 110, 114
 Hadrian 372, 374, 379
 Halle 320

- Hamilton, Lady Emma 320–21
 Hannibal 138, 142
 Harvard 354, 360, 363
 Hebe 117
 Hector 22, 125–26, 138–40, 152, 187
 Hecuba 16, 118, 123, 128–33, 135–38, 146–50, 152–53, 210–12, 214, 264, 266–67
 Hegel 238
 Hegio 291
 Helen 39, 77, 120–21, 140, 149, 210, 212–13, 264
 Helius. see also Sun 113
 Hellenism 66, 68, 70–71, 82–83, 239, 316
 Hellenistic 65–66, 76, 78, 177, 210, 217
 Hendel-Schütz, Henriette 320–21
 Hera. see also Juno 117
 Heraclea 69–70
 Heracles. see also Hercules 51, 57, 60–62, 69–70, 83, 117, 180
 herald 139, 177
 Herculaneum 384
 Hercules. see also Heracles 11, 93, 101, 105–17, 118, 133–34, 143–45, 171, 174–75, 180, 184–191, 241, 247–49, 255, 261, 264–67, 269, 292, 314–15, 360–63, 368, 380–81, 383
 heredity. see also legitimacy 161
 herm 362
 Hero 376
 hero 17, 48–49, 51, 53–58, 60–62, 70, 81, 83–84, 86–87, 112, 115, 179–80, 186, 188, 191, 194, 202–205, 209, 219–20, 223, 225, 232–33, 236, 247–48, 254, 294, 300, 303, 306, 313, 316, 320, 325, 334, 348, 352, 355–56, 361–62
 Hesperides 108
 hexameter 50, 200
 Heywood, Jasper 337–38
 Hieron 70–71
 Hieronymo 293
 Hippodamia 156–57
 Hippolytus 24–44, 134–35, 145, 171, 179–80, 182, 249, 262, 266, 319, 342–45
 Hissalrik 142
 historical drama. see also *praetexta* 126, 131, 143, 216–37, 241, 378
 homosexuality 342
 horror 125, 134–35, 137, 172, 180, 185, 187, 194, 247–48, 251, 322, 326–28, 331, 334, 351, 353
 horse racing 143, 369–70
 Hughes, Ted 335, 339, 341
 humiliation 137, 142, 146
 hybrid. see also conflation 73, 88, 143, 173, 195, 218, 231, 317
hybris 105, 113, 115, 188, 193
 Hydra 115–16
 Hyllus 57, 144–45
 Hymettan 148
 hypertragedy 329
 Hypsipyle 206

 iambic senarii 223
 identity 31, 39, 41, 44, 64, 66–67, 70–73, 77, 80–84, 86, 88, 93–94, 118, 203, 228, 232, 278, 300, 341
 Ilium. see also Troy 69, 80, 128, 139, 149, 210–13
 Iliona 69, 80, 128
 illusion 40, 80, 178, 182, 186, 341
 imitation 64, 254, 259, 314
 imperial cult 370, 379, 384, 387
imperium. see also power 152, 157, 161–62, 228, 256, 304
 incest 87, 280, 323, 327, 340–42
 India 76, 162
 infanticide 247
 Ino 18
 inscriptions 77, 228, 371, 373, 378, 380, 384
 Insubrian Gauls 216
 interpolations 95, 375
 intertexts 24–25, 28, 31, 38–41, 43–44, 158, 174, 188, 228, 231, 234, 241, 258, 339, 342, 346
 Iole 144–45
 Ionia 68–69
 Ionian Revolt 137
 Iphigeneia 121, 136, 143
 irony 35–36, 38, 40, 77, 84, 181, 209, 213, 263, 297
 Italian 74, 87, 162, 224
 Italica 372, 385
 Italy 16, 115, 118, 131, 225, 243, 373, 378
 Ithaca 48–49, 122

 Jacobean tragedy 322
 Jason (Argonauts) 31, 145, 203–209, 267, 269
 Jason of Tralles 371
Jaws 24, 40

- Jocasta 133, 228, 264–66, 270–73, 276–81, 340–42
- Jove. see also Jupiter and Zeus 188
- Joyce, James
Ulysses 351
- Julio-Claudian 138, 143, 151, 167, 234, 374
- Julius Caesar. see index below
- Julius Eurycles, Gaius 379
- Julius Lacon, Gaius 379
- Julius Paris 380
- Julius Secundus 100
- Junius Brutus Callaecus, Decimus 88, 226
- Junius Brutus, tyrannicide 237
- Juno. see also Hera 109, 112, 114–15, 117, 188, 248, 266
- Jupiter. see also Jove and Zeus 105, 107–17, 125, 146, 166, 193, 206, 289, 306
- Jupiter Optimus Maximus 238
- Justinian 369
- Kleist 311, 318–21
Penthesilea 318–21
 Scene 23: 320–21
Über das Marionettentheater 318
- Laius 264, 267, 277–81, 333, 338, 340–42
- lament 12, 16, 45, 48–49, 51–62, 114, 145, 186–88, 229, 242, 250, 259, 267, 297, 358
- Laocoön 33, 314, 316–17
- Laodamia 200–201, 214
- Lares 163, 295
- Lavinia (Vergil) 129
- Lavinia (Shakespeare) 325, 328
- Leander 376
- legitimacy 117, 160–61, 176
- Lemnos 206
- Lenaea 66
- Leptis Magna 385
- Lessing 54, 314–17
Miss Sara Sampson 315
Laocoön 316
Von dem Lateinischen Trauespielen welche unter dem Namen des Seneca bekannt sind 314
- Leto 117
- Lewis, Matthew 322
- libelli* 96, 100
- libretti 75, 172, 183
- Libya 162, 185, 374
- Lichas 117
- Licota 202
- lion 107, 110, 115, 385
- Lisbon 385
- Livia 384
- locus amoenus* 185
- locus horridus* 325, 328
- London 323, 348, 351
- loyalty 165, 234, 256, 258, 379, 387
- Lucilius (satirist) 50
- Lucilius (addressee of Seneca) 252
- Lucius (in Apuleius) 370
- Ludovico 362
- ludus* 63, 82–83, 196, 216–17, 237–38, 286, 367, 369–70, 373, 377, 381
Ludi Apollinares 82, 237
Ludi Herculenses 381
Ludi Megalenses 82
Ludi Romani 238, 370
ludi scaenici 63, 196, 216, 369–70
ludi votivi 217
- Luscious Lanuvinus 305
- Lyaeus 17–18, 199–200
- lyric poetry 200
- Lysidamus 293
- Lysol 353
- Macedo 245
- Macedonia 66, 70, 82, 239
- Macedonian Wars 122, 225
- Macrobius 119
- madness 26, 35, 113, 130, 142, 173, 248–49, 262, 283, 293–94, 298–300, 302–305, 315, 319–20
- Maenalus 107, 111
- Magna Graecia 63, 69, 73
- magic 262
- Magna Mater 82, 196
- Magnesia ad Menandrum 380
- Maia 157
- maiestas* 151
- Mammius Maximus, L. 384
- Manto 267, 340, 372
- marionettes. see also puppets 318
- Mars. see also Ares 117
- Marseille 332
- Marston 324
- martyr 363
- masks 41, 252, 254, 340, 362

- matricide 41
 Medea 16–17, 29–33, 44, 82, 87, 93–95, 115,
 133, 145, 162, 199–201, 203–209, 242,
 246–49, 253, 261–63, 266–67, 269–70,
 315, 323–25, 380
 melodrama 322, 325, 341, 350, 353
 Melos 137–38
 Melpomene 380
 Memmius 163
 Memnon 148
 Menaechmus 300–305
 Menard, Pierre 69
 Menelaus 121, 161, 177, 213
 Mercury 157, 381
 Messalina 383
 Messapian 73
 messenger. see also *nuntius* 18, 25, 27–28, 31,
 34, 39–40, 43, 80, 133–36, 141, 156, 166,
 171–85, 188, 191–94, 208, 224, 233, 277,
 283, 292, 321, 341, 343, 353
 Messenio 304
 Messina, straits 115
 metaphor 24, 31, 43, 75, 81, 118, 147, 224, 253,
 286–87, 324, 327, 358
 metatheatre 25, 38, 40, 253, 289, 294, 296,
 305, 374
 metics 82
 metonymy 108, 110, 139
 metre 7, 18, 21, 117, 119, 140, 144–45, 200–201,
 218, 231, 247, 285, 336
 micro-structure 106
 Middleton 324
 Miletus 88, 137, 373
 mime 134–35, 166, 172–75, 186, 191, 196, 254,
 285, 313, 320, 328, 340, 368, 370–71, 376,
 379–81
 Judgement of Paris 368, 370, 381, 385
 Minos 257, 306–307
 minstrel show 350–51
 missiles 368–69, 371
 monologue 180, 249–50, 261–71, 273, 276–77,
 294, 305, 335, 343
 monster 25–31, 33, 37–38, 40, 44, 109, 111–15,
 145, 179, 319, 340, 345, 358
 Montaigne 357, 362
 mosaics 373
 Mt. Oeta 57, 93, 101, 105, 117, 118, 134, 143–44,
 241, 255, 360–62, 368, 380
 Mt. Ossa 115
munus gladiatorium. see also gladiatorial
 games 369, 373, 375
 murder 49, 119, 147, 157, 162, 167, 171, 181,
 193–94, 208, 247, 254, 277–80, 315, 319,
 325, 331, 340–42, 349, 351, 370
 Muses 380, 385
 music 62, 173, 333, 370
 music hall 349
 mute = *mutae personae* 134, 172, 336, 386
 mutilation 43, 335
 Myrmidon 152
 Mysian 79
 myth 6, 15, 18, 31, 38–39, 41, 64–66, 72, 85,
 87, 109, 117, 132, 136, 141, 145, 152, 154–55,
 158, 162–63, 173, 183, 198, 200–201, 203,
 218–19, 222–25, 230–33, 236–37, 274–75,
 281, 286, 305, 307, 312, 319, 331, 334,
 336–37, 342, 346, 376, 380, 383, 385
 Nabatea 185
 narrator 171, 175–91
naumachia 370, 375, 382
 Nauplius 177
 necromancy 171, 333
 Nemea 110
 Nemesis 381–82
 Nemi 374–75
 Neoptolemus 124, 136, 242
 Neptune. see also Poseidon 25–26, 33, 35,
 177, 179, 188, 290
 Nereids 108
 Nereus 106, 108
 Nero 41, 103, 118, 142–44, 155, 166–67, 174,
 233, 235, 239, 249, 252, 254–59, 312, 355,
 371–72, 375, 384
 Nerva 369
 Nessus 57
 Netherlands 330
 New Comedy 60, 66
 Newton, Thomas 331
 Nicias the Younger
 Alexander 383
 Nietzsche 238, 355–56
 Nike 381–82
 Niobid 380
nostos-plays 65
 Notus 185

- Nuceria 383
nuntius. see also messenger 175, 179, 181, 192
 nurse 49, 204, 224, 233, 247, 249, 343–44
 nymph 70, 108
 nymphaeum 375

 Ocean 26, 108, 114, 185
 Octavia 93, 107, 118, 143–47, 166, 216, 226, 232–35, 241, 255–56, 258
 Octavian. see also Augustus 232
odeum 368, 374–75, 377
 Odrysian 252
 Odysseus. see also Ulysses 48–50, 53–62, 153, 251, 376
 Oechalia 144
 Oedipus 65, 83, 87, 96, 133, 171, 247–49, 260–82, 323–26, 330–47, 351, 358
 Oeniadae (Greece) 379
 Oenomaus 157, 209
 Oenone 343–45
 Oeta. see Mt. Oeta
 Old Comedy 66, 68, 146
 Olympus 108–109, 115, 188, 250
 Omer 342
 omnipresence 176, 178
 opera 74, 315
optimates. see also *boni* 157, 163
 Orcus 19
 Orestes 41, 65, 80–81, 86, 120, 154, 220, 244–45, 268, 359, 380
 Oropus 239
 Orpheus 145, 385
 Orphism 109
 orthography 21–22
 Oscan 63, 73
 Ossa. see Mt. Ossa
 Othello 362

 pain 48, 51–54, 56–62, 106, 145, 190, 227, 229, 324, 327
 palimpsestic 346
 Palladium 122
palliata 283
 Pamukkale 374
 Pan 385
 Panaetius of Rhodes 239
 panegyric 216, 227, 232, 239

 pantomime 134, 166, 172–75, 183–84, 196, 320–21, 368, 370, 380–81
 paratragic 304
 Pardalisca 293, 305
 Paris. see also Alexander 78, 120, 131, 210–13, 368, 370, 381, 385
 Paris 354, 372
 Theatre on the Rue Monge 372
 Parnassus 18, 317
 parody 283, 285, 294, 297, 300
 paroemiac 54
 parricide 304
 Parthians 162
 Pasicompsa 300
 passion 173, 198, 213, 241, 246–48, 250–51, 253, 259, 272, 276, 282, 313, 319, 346
 Pastor 164–66
 paternity. see also legitimacy 109, 161
 pathos 186, 209, 217
 Paulina (wife of Seneca) 254
 Pausias
 Sacrifice of Oxen 383
 Peleus 383
 Pelion 115, 204
 Pelops 156, 161–62
 Pelorus 115
 Penates 163, 273, 295–96
 Pentesilea 148, 311, 318–21, 329
 Pentheus 37, 306
 performance 10, 12–14, 24, 39–40, 46, 65–67, 69–71, 81, 85, 88, 93–96, 98, 102–103, 120, 134, 143, 146–50, 172–74, 184, 196–97, 202, 215, 217–18, 220, 223, 236–37, 238, 246, 251, 253–54, 260, 287, 289, 291–92, 299, 301, 304, 307, 315–16, 320–22, 330, 332–34, 343, 246, 355, 360, 367–87
 performers. see also actors 73, 318
 Perge 385
 Pericles 65, 82
 Perseus (king of Macedonia) 225, 229, 239
 Perseus, myth 29–30, 114, 116–17
 Persians 88, 176–78
 perspective 1, 116, 176, 178, 180, 195, 220, 223, 306–307, 321
 Phaedra 24–44, 134, 144–45, 171, 179–80, 182, 246–49, 261–63, 266–67, 319–20, 323–24, 326, 330–31, 333, 342–46
 Phalacreus 379

- Phaselis 371
 Philhellenic 314, 318, 329
 Philippianus Varus 379
 Philo of Larisa 51
 Philocrates 291
 Philoctetes 51, 61, 65, 87, 134, 201, 225, 260, 316
 Philomela 209, 252
 philosophy 19, 47–51, 54, 58, 62, 64, 103, 154, 161, 175, 195, 238–59, 260–82, 320, 348, 351, 348–63
 Phoebus. *see also* Apollo 106, 108, 113, 192, 277
 Phorbas 289, 340
pietas 162, 234
 Pisaurum 73
 Piso (would-be assassin of Nero) 254
 pity 37, 125, 127–28, 130, 143, 187, 201, 322
 plague 110, 273, 278, 322, 339–40
 Plautinopolis 308
 Plautus (victim of Nero) 256
 plot 4, 6, 10, 15–18, 23, 40, 46, 48, 57, 65, 80, 126, 157–58, 160, 164, 172, 219, 235–36, 247–50, 254, 279, 281, 289, 291, 293–94, 301, 305, 320, 322, 324, 329, 335, 341, 344–45
polis 68–69, 82–83, 97, 89, 117
 politics 64, 67–69, 72, 79, 82, 87–88, 142, 151–67, 194, 197, 225–28, 235, 237, 238, 240–41, 255, 257–59, 271, 281–82, 314, 375
 pollution 156, 328
 Polybius (presumed father of Oedipus) 280
 Polybius (Greek statesman) 239
 Polybius (advisor of Claudius) 242
 polygeneric 174
 Polydorus 128
 Polygnotus
 Man with a Shield 383
 Polymester 137
 Polynices 228
 Polyxena 43–44, 121, 135–36, 139, 143, 248, 264
 Pompeii
 large theatre 93, 101, 143, 374–75, 377
 odeum 377
 Pompeius Macer 96
 Pompey 41, 120, 232, 239, 378, 383
 Pomponius Laetus 214
 Poppaea 144, 146, 256
 Poseidon. *see also* Neptune 31
 post-colonial 67, 71–74, 76
 Pound, Ezra 349–352, 354
 power. *see also imperium* 26, 51–52, 59, 61, 69–74, 76, 87, 108–109, 139, 146, 151–52, 155, 159–63, 165–66, 181–83, 186, 188–89, 192, 205, 230, 233, 247, 249–50, 252, 256, 258–59, 271, 273, 279, 281–82, 286, 290, 297, 304–305, 307, 314, 319, 324–25, 327, 329, 332–33, 335–36, 346, 355
praetexta. *see also* historical drama 41, 88, 100, 151, 216–37
 Priam 39, 123–25, 128–31, 136, 147, 152, 187, 193–94, 210–12
 Proclus 49
 Procne 209, 252, 335
 prologue 102, 105–106, 114, 116, 146, 149, 203, 261, 265, 266, 271–72, 276, 281, 287–91, 294, 336, 343, 350
 Prometheus 51, 61, 62, 133
 Propertius 202
 props 132, 291
 Prospero 72
 Protesilaus 214–15
 prostitutes 351
 psychology 164, 241, 245, 257, 340, 357–58
 Ptolemaic 142
 Punic Wars 63, 82, 225, 238, 283
 puppets 313
 Pylades 80, 86, 154
 Pyrrhic dance 370
 Python 116

quadrans 369

 Racine 342–45, 357
 Phèdre 342–45
 Radcliffe, Ann 322
 radio plays 99, 349–50
 rape 70, 188, 209, 306, 323, 325, 327–38, 342, 345
 realism 174, 186, 316
 reception 5, 15, 46, 51, 55, 65–66, 70, 74, 101, 138, 173, 196–215, 236–37, 240–41, 283–84, 314, 330–31, 367, 380, 387

- recitation 41, 97–103, 105, 172–74, 184, 233,
 320, 350, 359, 367
 recognition. see also *anagnorisis* 30, 81, 109,
 194, 252–52, 263, 315
 Rehberg 320
 Attitudes [of Lady Hamilton]
 reliefs 141, 362, 380, 382, 384–85
 religion 64, 81–88, 346, 353
 reminiscence 123, 197, 208, 328
 Remus 143
 Renaissance 240, 348–49
res gestae 216, 233
 Restoration tragedy 322
retarius 42
 revenge 156, 160, 173, 192, 209, 249–52, 325,
 328
 revenge dramas 230, 311, 322, 325, 328
 reversal of fortune. see also *fortuna adversa*
 154, 187, 192, 229
 Rhesus 148
 rhetoric 46–47, 50, 58–60, 62, 105–17, 121,
 153, 163, 172, 177, 182, 188–89, 191–95,
 196, 202, 205, 214, 292, 307, 313–16,
 321–23, 332, 357, 360
 ring composition 274, 291
 rivalry 110, 114, 167, 221–22
romanitas 295
 romanization 64, 74–75, 88–89, 152, 163,
 167
 Roma, deified statue 381, 385
 Rome 38, 41, 45–46, 51, 61–62, 63–69, 72–74,
 77, 79, 81–83, 85–86, 88–89, 93–94, 97,
 118, 122, 138, 142, 151, 154, 157–58, 167,
 173–74, 216–37, 238–39, 245, 283, 307,
 312, 314, 322, 332, 369–70, 372, 376, 378,
 380, 383–85, 387.
 forum 85, 163
 Temple to Apollo 83
 Temple to Cybele 83
 Theatre of Balbus 385
 Theatre of Marcellus 371
 Theatre of Pompey 120, 232, 239, 383
 Theatre of Scaurus 148, 383
 Romulus 143, 216, 222–23, 225–26
 Russia 75

 Sabratha, city 381, 385
 Sabratha, deified statue 381, 385

 sack 81, 144
 Sack of Miletus 88, 138
 Syracuse 138
 sacrifice 33, 43–44, 136, 138, 143, 163, 181, 194,
 211, 227, 230, 232, 234, 236, 250, 319, 337,
 340–42, 373, 383, 385
 Sagalassus 379
 Saint Narcissus 363
 Saint Sabastian 363
 Salamis 176, 296
 Salii 154
 Santayana
 Three Philosophical Poets 354
 Sarmatians 162
 satire 50, 93, 245, 325
 satyrs 148, 381, 385
 satyr drama 368, 380
 Scaurus, M. Aemilius 38, 148, 383
 Sceledrus 290
scholae 50
 Schiller 54, 314
 Aesthetische Briefe 314
 Schlegel 311–29
 Vorlesungen über Dramatische Kunst und
 Literatur 312–18
 Schopenhauer 238
 Scipio Nasica 163
 sculpture. see also statues 141, 314, 318,
 320–21, 385
 Second Sophistic 71
 seers 84, 211–12, 231, 358
 Segesta 379, 385
 Seleucid War 122
 Selge 370
 semiotics 316, 376–79
senex 140, 267, 270–71, 276, 281, 293, 305
 Sentinum 216, 230
servus callidus 305
 Shakespeare 72, 254, 312, 322, 328, 348–49,
 353–57, 361–62
 Hamlet 328
 King Lear 328
 Macbeth 254, 328
 Othello 362
 Tempest 72
 Titus Andronicus 324–25, 328
 Shaw, George Bernard 349

- Shelley 311–29
 Cenci 322–29
 shepherd 29, 31, 40, 213–14, 281, 340
 Sibyl 189
 Sicily 26, 63, 70, 115, 371–72, 374, 384–85
 Sileni 385
 simile 27–28, 35, 174, 181–82, 219, 315, 334
 Sitifis 369
 Sminthe 154
 Socrates 254, 356, 362
 soldiers 52–53, 64, 140, 167, 178, 184, 193, 267, 291, 297, 383
 Soranus 76
 Sosia 292
 soul 35, 51–54, 127, 198, 209, 242–43, 245–46, 248, 251–52, 257, 264, 318, 325, 334, 342, 357–58
 space 25, 28, 43, 66, 81–88, 180, 183, 198–99, 221, 226, 232, 269, 318, 336, 367, 373, 375
sparagmos 319
sparsio 368–69, 375
 Sparta 69–70, 120, 137, 385
 spectacle 25–26, 38–44, 85, 134, 148, 150, 174, 179, 182, 184, 188, 253, 260, 306–307, 333, 367–87
 illusionist spectacles 179, 182, 188
 spectators. *see also* audience 26, 44, 106, 162, 174–75, 177, 179, 182–83, 185–87, 189–92, 194–95, 248, 252–53, 262, 306–308, 317, 321, 376, 383
 speech 8, 10, 12, 18, 25, 27, 34, 43, 45–46, 51, 57, 60–62, 79–80, 97–98, 105–106, 115–16, 122, 134, 139, 142, 147, 152–53, 156, 162, 171–72, 174–88, 190–94, 224, 231, 257, 267, 269, 290–92, 295, 308, 313, 321–22, 324–25, 328, 333, 335, 340, 343, 345, 353, 360, 362
sportula 369, 371
stagnum 375
 statues. *see also* sculpture 148, 317–18, 321, 362, 371, 373, 376, 379–87
 Sterope 157
stichomythia 350
 Stobi 378–79
 Stoic 80, 106, 111, 115, 195, 238–59, 260–82, 348–63
 storm 26, 30, 35, 114, 120, 122, 171, 177–79, 181, 184–88, 192–94, 289–90, 298–99
 Strymonian 185
 stucco 384
stuprum 159
 Stymphalus 107, 110
 Stygian 189
 suicide 57, 138, 236, 254–55, 319, 341
 Sulla (dictator) 155, 374
 Sulla (victim of Nero) 256
 Sun. *see also* Helius 36, 107–108, 113–14, 190, 206, 231, 243, 298–99, 361
 suspension of disbelief 80, 148
 Swinburne 350
 Syracuse 138, 300
 Syrtes 185

tableaux vivants 320–21
 Tagus 162
 Talthybius 139, 268
 Tantalids 192, 357
 Tantalus 161, 181, 249, 266, 268, 333, 336, 338
 Tantalus, son of Thyestes 162, 265
 Tarentum 73
 Tarquinius Superbus 230–31
taurobolia 371
tauromachia 371
 Tauromenium 372, 380
 Taurus 80, 86
 Telamon 297
 Telegonus 57, 380
Telegony 49
 Telemachus 380
 Tennyson 350
 Tereus 209, 237, 252
 Termessus 378
 Terpsichore 380
 terror 31–33, 140, 154, 178, 187, 211, 304, 322
 Teucer 294–300
 Thaleia 70
 Thalia 380
 Thasos 372
 theatres 11, 24–44, 54, 71, 83, 86, 94–95, 132–34, 143, 148, 287, 292, 307–308, 311, 316–18, 329, 330, 332–333, 345, 349–50, 367–87
 aditus maximus 383

- annular passage 384
aulaeum 148, 385
 balustrade 384
bisellia 377–78
cavea 80, 377, 384, 387
cuneus 378
kolymbethra 373–76
 Nemesis Gate 381–82
nymphaeum 375
 orchestra 132, 188, 370–78, 381, 383–84, 386
podia 385
post scaenum 383
porticus 378, 384, 386
praecinctio 377–78, 384
proscenium 381–82, 385
pulpitum 385
scaena 10, 99, 132, 196, 290
scaenae frons 148, 385–86
tribunal 377–78
 Victory Gate 382
vomitrium 383–84
 Thebes 66, 83, 123, 273, 276, 278, 340–41
 Theseus 21, 31, 35, 38, 83, 134–36, 145, 180, 189–91, 263, 267, 342–43, 345
 Thessalian 139
 Thetis 383
thiasos 300
 Thoas 80, 86
 Thrace 128, 139, 252, 255
 threnody 140
 throne 109, 268, 333, 336, 338
 Thyestes 9, 94–95, 100, 133–34, 151–67, 171, 181, 209, 225, 232–33, 236, 242, 247–52, 255–58, 261–63, 265–66, 268, 270, 314–15, 323–26, 330–47, 352, 355, 386
 Tiberius (Gracchus) 155, 163
 Tiberius (emperor) 258, 371, 379, 383–84
 tigers 373
 tight-rope walkers 370
 Tiresias 267, 277, 340, 358
 Titan 113
togata. see also comedy 214, 220–21
 tragicomedy 353
 Trajan 239, 372, 374, 384
 transitions 106, 180, 321
 translations 6, 23, 51, 62, 69, 72, 74–81, 121, 151, 153, 244, 317, 330–31, 334, 339, 342, 346, 348, 354, 362
 transnationalism 73–74
 triumph 41, 57, 113–14, 137, 142, 166, 216, 224, 227, 229–30, 232, 253, 262, 305
 trochaic septinarii 54, 57–58, 60, 223
 Troy. see also Ilium 16, 39, 41, 65–66, 118–50, 152, 171, 177, 184–85, 187–88, 192–94, 212–14, 225, 268, 287, 305
 Scaean Gates 39
 Theatre A 379
 Trojans 65, 72, 79, 84–85, 87, 118–50, 178, 187, 193, 376
 Trojan War 65, 118–50, 151, 185, 187–88, 192, 225, 232
tumor 284–85, 308
 Tunisia 373, 379
 Turkey 370, 372–75, 382
 Tusculum 50, 380
 Theatre 380
 Tyndarus 291
 tyranny 155–56, 160, 163–64, 167, 225, 235, 241, 249, 257, 312
 Ulysses. see also Odysseus 121–22, 126, 139–40, 153, 267, 351
 Underworld 19, 110, 114, 134, 145, 171, 174, 180–81, 183, 189–90, 358
 unity of place 226
 unity of time 235, 315
urbs 74, 83
 Utica 236
 Vatinius 374
venationes. see also wild beast hunts 368–71, 373, 375, 383, 385
 vengeance. see also revenge 247, 250, 335, 338
 Venus 32, 148, 300, 343, 345
 Verona 385
 Vespasian 372
vestibulum 190
 Vesuvius 141
 vice 245–47, 253, 259
 Victorian 386
 Vienne 385

- violence 42, 123, 126, 187, 193, 231, 253,
 256, 276, 319, 322, 325, 334, 336, 352–53,
 381
 virtue. see also *exemplum virtutis* 50–51,
 58, 60, 81, 115, 246, 251, 255–56, 282,
 285, 351
 Volscus, Antonius 214
 Vulcan 117

 water ballet 368, 375
 Weimar 314, 317–18

 wild beasts. see also venationes 27, 33, 112,
 194, 344, 370
 Williams, Bernard 238
 Winckelmann 314, 316
 On the imitation of the painting and
 sculpture of the Greeks 314

 Xerxes 231

 Zephyrus 185
 Zeus. see also Jove and Jupiter 31, 70, 247

Index of Ancient Authors and Passages

Abbreviations

- TrGF = *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, ed. A. Nauck, rev. B. Snell, *postea* Kannicht (1985). Göttingen.
- TrRF = *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta. Vol. I. Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Tragicci Minores, Adespota*, ed. M. Schauer (2012); *Vol. II. Ennius*, ed. G. Manuwald (2012). Göttingen.
- Dang = Dangel, J. (ed.) 1995. *Accius. OEuvres (fragments)*. Paris
- Joc = Jocelyn, H.D. (ed.), 1967. *The Tragedies of Ennius: the Fragments*. Cambridge
- R = Ribbeck, O. (18973). *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta: I. Tragicorum Fragmenta; II. Comitorum Fragmenta*. Leipzig.
- Schierl = Schierl, Petra (2006). *Die Tragödien des Pacuvius*. Berlin.
- Va = Vahlen, I. (ed.) 1903. *Ennianae poesis reliquiae, iteratis curis recensuit*. Leipzig
- w = Warmington, E. H. *Remains of Old Latin*. Vol. 1. Ennius, Caecilius (1935); Vol. 11 Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Pacuvius, Accius (1936). Cambridge, Mass.

adespota

	R ³ I.4.169–170	127
TrRF I adespota 23; R ³ I.139–140	R ³ I.12.185–186	127
TrRF I adespota 24; R ³ I.195–196 Ennius,	R ³ I.13.187–188	127
Iphigeneia	Atreus	88, 155–56, 163, 181, 246, 307
TrRF I adespota 58; R ³ I incert. auct. incert.	R ³ I.1; W II.380	157
fab. 85–87; w 319 Ennius <i>Telamo</i> :	R ³ I; W II.381	156
TrRF I adespota 74; R ³ I.165–171; w 5–11	R ³ I.1.200–201	209
incert. auct. <i>Medea</i>	R ³ I.1.240/242	200, 242
TrRF I adespota 76.1–12; R ³ I incert. auct.	R ³ I.1.357–358; W II.351–352	10
incert. fab. 5–16; w 38–49 Ennius	R ³ I.1.364; W II.358	11
Alexandros	R ³ I.1.365; W II.359	11
TrRF I adespota 89; R ³ I incert. auct.	R ³ I.2; W II.162	156
Aenea 1.1	R ³ I.3; W II.163–166	158
TrRF I adespota 107; R ³ I incert. auct. incert.	R ³ I.3–8; W II.163–177	156, 158
fab. 9.21	R ³ I.3.200; W II.165	160
TrRF I adespota 136; R ³ I.172–173; 282–283	R ³ I.5.203; W II.168	155–56, 160, 197,
Ennius <i>Medea</i>	241, 257–58, 306–307	
TrRF I adespota 168–170; R ³ I.96–100;	R ³ I.6; W II.169	159
w 147–149	R ³ I.7; W II.170–172	159, 161
anonymous	R ³ I.8; W II.173–177	160
Nonae Caprotinae	R ³ I.9; W II.178	157
	R ³ I.9–9a; W II.178–180	156
Accius	R ³ I.10; W II.181–182	161
6, 10–11, 13–14, 29–33, 39–41, 43–44,	R ³ I.11–12; W II.186–189	157
45–47, 51, 60–62, 69, 73, 76–78, 88,	R ³ I.12; W II.187–189	160
94, 122–23, 126–28, 151–52, 155–63, 181,	R ³ I.13; W II.183–185	156, 161
196–97, 200–201, 207–209, 214, 216,	R ³ I.14; W II.190	161
220, 222–23, 225–266, 230–32, 236–37,	R ³ I.14–15; W II.190–198	157
241–42, 246, 248, 256–59, 306–307	R ³ I.15; W II.192	161
Aeneadae aut Decius	R ³ I.15; W II.192–193	162
Astyanax	R ³ I.16; W II.196–197	162
R ³ I.1.164		

- Accius (*cont.*)
 R³I.17; W II.194 158
 R³I.17; W II.194–195 162
 R³I.20; W II.199–200 157, 161
Brutus 13, 216, 220, 222, 223, 226, 230, 237
 R³I.40; W II.40 11
Clytemnestra 41, 232
Deiphobus
 R³I.4.131–132 122
Didascalía 76
Diomedes
 R³I.1.270 122
Epigoni
 R³I.3.288 123
Epinausimache 69
 R³I.1.308 123
 R³I.12.322–323 123
Eurysaces 13–14
Hecuba 214
Medea sive Argonautae 29–33, 44,
 207–208
 381–396 29–30
 387 31
Meleager
 R³I.1.460 60
Nyctegresia
 R³I.9.491 122
Oenomaus
 R³I.1.508 209
Philocteta 61
Pragmatica 76
Tereus 237
Trojan Women 128
incerta
 R³I.359–360; W I.353–354 10–13
 Aeschylus 42, 51, 61, 66, 68–70, 83, 85, 88,
 120, 123, 133, 141–42, 146, 176–78, 231,
 260, 312, 359
Aetnaeae 70
Agamemnon 42, 133, 141, 177
 650–679 177
Eumenides 83, 85, 120
Persians 88, 176–78, 231
 249–514 176
Philoctetes 260
Prometheus Bound 133
Prometheus Unbound 51, 61
Seven against Thebes 123
 Afranius 285, 305
 Alcaeus
 fr. 73 31
 fr. 208 31
 Alexander of Aphrodisias
On fate 31.13 272
 Apollodorus 108, 114
Library
 2.106 114
 2.5.2 108
 2.5.5 108
 2.5.11 108
 Pseudo-Apollodorus 78
 Apollonius of Rhodes 110, 203, 208, 211–12
Argonautica
 1.1290 110
 Apuleius 368, 370
Metamorphoses
 10.34 368
 Aristarchus
Achilles 288
 Aristophanes
Acharnians
 450–453 251
 480–488 251
 Aristotle 49, 240, 291
Poetics
 1453b33 49
 Augustus 95–96, 232
Ajax 95–96
 Aurelius, Marcus Antoninus
Meditations 242
 Balbus, G. Cornelius 226, 378
Iter 226
 Caecilius
Plocium 284
 Calpurnius Siculus
 7.65–68 375
 Cato
De agricultura 1
 Catullus
 68 214
 Censorinus
 GL 6.614.7–13K 285
 Cicero 4, 6–8, 10, 13–14, 19, 21, 45–62, 63,
 65–66, 80, 86, 97–99, 101, 130, 154–56,

- 158–59, 163, 197, 214, 223, 230–31, 237,
239–42, 245–46, 248, 257, 259, 286–87,
306–307, 377–78
- Brutus* 230
- 72 63
- 167 214
- De amicitia*
- 41 163
- De divinatione* 46
- 1.21.42 130
- 1.31.66–67 130
- De inventione* 46
- De legibus* 239
- De natura deorum* 80
- 3.68 246
- 3.68.2 158
- De officiis* 257
- 1.97 257, 306
- De oratore* 46
- 3.41.166 287
- 3.219 159
- De re publica* 239
- Orator* 46
- 160 21
- Epistulae ad Atticum* 46
- 3.12 98
- 3.15 98
- Laelius* see *De amicitia*
- Philippics*
- 1.34 257
- 1.34.2 155
- 1.35 257
- Pro Plancio*
- 102.11 155
- Pro Sestio* 14, 46
- 120 13
- 120–123 10
- 121 13
- 123 13
- Tusculae Disputationes* 46
- 1.48 19
- 2.19.25 51
- 2.20 57
- 2.20–22 61
- 2.38–39 51
- 2.42 52
- 2.43 58, 61
- 2.47–50 48
- 2.48–51 52–53
- 3.5 242
- 3.44–45 242
- ps.-Cicero
- Rhetorica ad Herennium* 46
- Cleanthes
- Hymn to Zeus* 247
- Codex Justinianus
- Novella*
- 105 369
- Corpus inscriptionum latinorum (CIL)*
- 2.4514 (Barcelona) 373
- 8.6944 (Cirta) 371
- 8.6947 (Cirta) 371
- 8.6948 (Cirta) 371
- 8.7000 (Cirta) 371
- 8.7095 (Cirta) 371
- 8.7122 (Cirta) 371
- 8.7960 (Ruscida) 371
- 8.7963 (Cirta) 371
- 8.8438 (Sitifis) 369
- 8.19489 (Cirta) 371
- 8.19513 (Cirta) 371
- 10.7295 (Panormus) 371
- Curatius Maternus 99–100, 233, 236
- Cato* 100, 233, 236
- Domitius* 236
- Thyestes* 100, 233, 236
- Dio of Prusa
- 52.2.3 260
- Dio Cassius 41, 103, 167, 254–55, 375
- 61.9.5 375
- 62.16–18 41
- 62.25.1–3 255
- 63.9.5 41
- 63.10 167
- Diogenes Laertius
- 7.180 247
- Diomedes (grammarian) 219–21
- Donatus 219–20, 260, 306
- 265.4 260
- Ennius 6–11, 13–22, 45–47, 51–52, 62,
63–64, 66, 73, 77–79, 85, 88, 120–21,
124–25, 128–29, 151–54, 200, 204–207,

Ennius (*cont.*)

210–13, 216, 222–23, 225–26, 228–31, 235,
241–43, 246, 288

Achilles 152, 288

Alcmeo

TrRF 11.13.4–5; R³1.27–28 211

Alexandros 78, 210, 230

TrRF 11.16; R³1.38 213

TrRF 11.21.2; R³1.58 206–207

see also *incerta* below

Ambracia 216, 222–23, 226, 229

Andromacha 8–10, 13–16, 18–19, 88

see *incerta* below

Andromacha Aechmalotis 124–25

TrRF 11.23–33; R³1.63–70–88, 90,
94 124

TrRF 11.23.1–2; R³1.12.91–93 125

TrRF 11.23.3; R³1.10.89 125

TrRF 11.23.4–17; R³1.9.75–88 124

TrRF 11.23.10; R³1.81; W 1.101 11

TrRF 11.23.15; R³1.86; W 1.106 11, 154

see also *incerta* below

Annales 223, 225, 241–42

Skutsch 206–208; W 1.229–230

241–42

Skutsch 211–212; W 1.232–234 242

Atamas

TrRF 11.42; R³1.107–111; W 1.128–

132 17–18, 200

Erechtheus 20, 85

see *incerta* below

Eumenides 7, 85

see *incerta* below

Hectoris lytra 22, 152

TrRF 11.71; R³1.182–183; W 1.194–195 22

Hecuba

TrRF 11.73; R³1.165–167; W

1.206–208 153

TrRF 11.78; R³1.3.164 128

Iphigeneia

TrRF 1 *adespota* above

Medea exul 16–17, 207–208, 246

TrRF 11.89.1–7; R³1.205–211 204

TrRF 11.89.9; R³1.213 205

TrRF 11.90; R³1.240; W 1.271 242

TrRF 11.92; R³1.233 205

TrRF 11.94; R³1.242–243; W

1.294–295 17

TrRF 11.95.1–2; R³1.237 206

TrRF 11.96.1; R³1.214 205

TrRF 11.97.1; R³1.235 205

Pythius Apollo 8

Sabinae 216, 222–23, 225, 228, 235

Telamo 242

TrRF 1 *adespota* above

Thyestes 9, 225, 246

TrRF 11.136; R³1.295; W 1.353 9

incerta

TrRF 11.146; R³1.350–353; W 1.150–153

Eumenides 7

TrRF 11.147; R³1.340; W 1.400

Alexandros 242

TrRF 11.151.1–15; R³1.6.39–53

Alexandros 45, 129

TrRF 11.151.10; R³1.6.48 *Alexandros* 212

TrRF 11.151.12–15 = R³1.6.50–53

Alexandros 213

TrRF 11.151.16; R³1.64 *Alexandros* 78,
213

TrRF 11.151.18; R³1.7.56 *Alexandros* 120

TrRF 11.153; R³1.314 52

TrRF 11.154; R³1.332; W 1.183 156

TrRF 11.156; R³1.360; W 1.408–409 242

TrRF 11.157.23; R³1.69, 75–80,

81–88; W 1.94–108, 363–365

Andromacha 45, 242

TrRF 11.157.24; R³1.70–72; W 1.113–116

Andromacha 18–19

TrRF 11.157.32; R³1.66–67; W 1.86–87

Andromacha 8–9

TrRF 11.163; R³1.379 200

TrRF 11.179; R³1.99 *Andromacha*

aechmalotis 77–78, 125

TrRF 11.181; R³1.407; W 1.404 243

TrRF 11.182; R³1.488; W 1.401 242–43

TrRF 11.198; R³1.383–384; W 1.140–141

Erechtheus 20

Epictetus 247, 362

Discourses

1.4.24 362

1.4.26 247

1.28.7–9 247

2.17.19–22 247

Euripides 16–18, 24, 28, 37–38, 43, 60, 64, 66,
68–70, 76–78, 80, 82–83, 86, 118, 121, 132,
137–38, 148, 152–54, 174, 176, 180, 182,

- 204–205, 208, 214, 228, 244, 247, 251,
 253, 260, 290, 312, 316–17, 342–43, 359,
 371, 376
Aegeus 24
Alcmene 290
Andromache 16, 77
Archelaus 70
Bacchae 24, 37, 371
Children of Heracles 69–70, 83
Chrysippus
 TrGF 836 244
Cyclops 376
Erechtheus 83
Hecuba 16, 152–53
 291 153
 291–292 153
 293–295 152
Heracles
 1163–1428 180
Hippolytus 24, 38, 43, 180, 182, 343
 1173 180
 1173–1254 28
 1179 180
 1187 180
 1195–1197 180
 1198 180
 1199 180
 1201 28
 1204 180
 1206 180
 1206–1208 180
 1213–1214 28
 1215–1248 28
 1216 180
 1219 180
 1221 28
 1240 140
Ino 18
Ion 317
Iphigeneia at Aulis 64
Iphigeneia at Tauris 80, 154, 316
 1422 86
Medea 16–17, 82, 204–205, 247
 167 208
 476–482 209
 1334 208
Orestes 359
Philoctetes 260
Phoenissae 228, 342
Protesilaos 214
Suppliant Women 83
Trojan Women 16, 118, 132, 137–38, 148
Evanthius 219–20, 285, 305
 De fabula 3.5 285, 305
Festus 20, 45, 286
 p.394.33–37 Li 20
Gellius 20, 153, 155, 163, 245, 284
 2.21 284
 4.17.14 20
 11.4.1 153
 13.2.2 155
 13.8.4 245
Herodotus
 6.21.10 137
Homer 39, 48, 51, 117, 122, 152, 166, 185–86,
 251, 321
 Iliad
 3.181–244 39
 5.850–861 117
 11.804–848 51
 Odyssey
 5.295–298 185
 5.299–312 186
 8.517–520 122
 19 48
 20.27–28 251
Homeric hymns
 Apollo
 300–362 109
 339 109
Horace 31–32, 72, 135, 174, 197, 220–23, 227,
 231, 284
 Ars poetica 89 220, 284
 Odes
 1.5 32
 1.14 32
 1.22.23–24 135
 1.27 32
 1.33 32
Hyginus 18, 65, 214
 Fabulae
 4 18
 103–104 214

- Julius Caesar 63, 95–96, 103, 236–37, 254,
257, 259, 378
 Oedipus 96
Juvenal 123, 371
 6.71 371
- Laevius
 Protesilaudamia 214
- Livius Andronicus 6, 18, 47, 68, 70, 73, 77,
118–19, 151, 222, 225, 238, 283, 286
 Aegisthus
 TrRF I.2; R³I.13–14 118–19
 Equus Troianus
 TrRF I.14; R³I.20–22 120
 Ino 18
 Ludius
 R³II.2; W II *fabulae palliatae* 2 286
 Oduisseia 222
- Livy 239, 376
 7.2 239
 34.44.5 376
 34.54.5–8 376
- Longinus
 On the Sublime
 15.1 359
- Lucan
 Civil War
 1.1 251
- Lucian 173, 183
 De saltante
 60 183
 61 173, 183
- Lucretius 239, 354
- Manilius 223
- Martial
 LS 25 376
- Maternus 99–101, 216, 233, 236
 Cato 100–101, 216, 233, 236
 Domitius 233, 236
 Thyestes 100, 233, 236
- Menander 284, 382
 Plocium 284
- Naevius 6, 47, 80, 86, 119, 126, 151, 209, 216,
218, 222–23, 225–26, 232, 283, 286
 Andromacha
 TrRF I.3.1; R³I.1.1–2 126
- Bellum Punicum* 222–23
 Clastidium 216, 222, 232
 Equus Troianus 119
 Gymnasticus
 R³II.57; W II *fabulae palliatae* 55 286
 Iphigeneia in Taurus 80
 TrRF I.3.16; R³I.62; non W II 86
 Lycurgus
 TrRF I.3.34.2; R³I.22 209
 Romulus 216, 222, 226, 232
- Nonius Marcellus 8–9, 45, 60, 123, 214, 286
 De compendiosa doctrina
 95.26 Merc. 286
 164.23–25 Merc. 9
 186.1–3 Merc. 9
 233.16 Merc. 123
- Novius
 Exodium 370–71
- Ovid 24, 28–31, 33–37, 44, 94–96, 131, 174, 185,
196–215, 216, 226, 252, 255
 Amores
 1.3.11 200
 2.2.10 200
 3.1 198
 3.1.67–70 198–99
 3.15.1–2 199
 3.15.15–20 199
 Ars amatoria 200
 Epistulae ex Ponto 201
 Fasti
 4.326 216, 226
 Heroides 201–202
 3.36 205
 4 24
 6.11 208
 6.129–130 206
 12 203–210
 12.7 205
 12.7–10 203–204
 12.21 203
 12.30 205
 12.47 205
 12.57 205
 12.75–76 205
 12.78–79 206
 12.113–116 206
 12.171 208
 12.180–182 203

- 12.207 209
 12.207–209 203
 12.211 210
 12.211–212 209
 12.212 203
 13 214–15
 16.43–50 210–211
 16.46 212
 16.111–112 213
 16.123–124 212
 16.357–362 213
 17.119 205
 17.237–240 212
Ibis
 435–436 207
Medea 94–95, 200, 204–205
Metamorphoses
 3.110 209
 3.225–237 37
 4.688–690 29
 4.689 30
 4.706–708 29
 4.728–729 30–31
 6.424–674 252
 6.618–619 209
 7 24
 9.229–272 255
 11.474–477 185
 11.490–491 185
 15.506–513 28
 15.506–529 28
 15.508 29
 15.508–510 31
 15.510 29
 15.511 35
 15.514–529 34–35
 15.529 35
Remedia amoris 200
Tristia
 2 201
 2.381–382 196, 201
 2.401 201
 2.403 201
 3.9.25–34 206–207

Pacuvius 6, 45–62, 68–69, 77, 79–81, 84,
 88, 94, 128, 151–52, 154–55, 214–15, 216,
 219–20, 222, 229, 243–45, 251, 294–300

Armorum Iudicium 152
Atalanta 80
Chryses 79–81, 84, 88, 154–55, 219–20,
 243–45
 R³I.80–82; W II.101–103; Schierl 76 154
 R³I.83–85; W II.104–106; Schierl
 77 154
 R³I.89; W II.110–111; Schierl 79 79–81
 R³I.89, R³I.90; W II.110–115; Schierl
 79–80 243
Dulorestes 80, 88, 209
 R³I.118; W II.159; Schierl 95 209
Iliona 69, 80, 128
Medus 80
Niptra 48–58
 R³I.256–267,
 R³I.268–269; W II.280–91, W II.294–95;
 Schierl 199, Schierl 200
Orestes = *Dulorestes* 219–20
Paulus 216, 229
Periboea
 R³I.285; W II.305–307; Schierl 211 245
Protesilaus 214–15
Teucer 294–300
 R³I.327–330; W II.345–349; Schierl
 243 296
 R³I.342–343; W II.342; Schierl
 244 297
 R³I.409–416; W II.353–360; Schierl
 239 298–99
 R³I. *incert. auct. incert. fab* 92; W II.380;
 Schierl 250 300
 unassigned
 R³I.348 *Teucer*; W II. *incert. auct. incert.*
fab 11; Schierl *incert. fab* 4 245
 R³I.364; W II.
 R³I.342–343; W II. *incert. auct. incert.*
fab 342; Schierl *incert. fab* 244 80
 R³I.370; W II *incert. auct. incert. fab*
 37–46; Schierl 262.5 244–45 244
 R³I.391; W II *incert. auct. incert. fab* 10;
 Schierl *incert. fab* 294 123

Philemon
Emporos 294
Photius
Lexicon 49
Phrynichus
Sack of Miletus 88, 137, 373

- Plautus (*cont.*)
- Plato 51, 240, 251, 254, 353
Respublica
 390d 251
 441b 251
- Plautus 1, 66, 84–86, 94–95, 241, 243,
 283–308
Amphitruo 287, 292–93, 304
 186–189 292
 1053 292
 1053–1056 292
 1055 292
 1058 293
Asinaria 287
Aulularia
 671 293
 713 293
Bacchides
 925–978 305
Captivi 290–91
 54–59 290–91
 1033–1034 291
Casina 293, 305
 621–624 293
Curculio 85
Menaechmi 300–305
 287–293 300–301
 818–819 301
 828–831 301–302
 835–839 302
 840–842 302
 857–858 303
 862–868 303–304
 870–871 304
 941–945 304
Mercator 294–300, 304–305
 9–10 294
 653 300
 830–841 294–95
 833 296
 834–36 295
 851–856 296–97
 852 298
 867–871 297
 870 298
 872 298
 872–879 298
 890 299
 910 299
 911 299
 931–933 299
 933 295
 946–947 300
Mostellaria 287
Poenulus 241, 287–90
 1–4 287–88
Rudens 241, 288–90
 1–7 288
 2 289
 7 289
 9 289
 32 289
 83–87 289–90
 1249–1253 241
- Pliny (Elder)
Historia naturalis
 9.4 38
- Pliny (Younger) 95–101, 239
Epistles
 1.1.1 97
 1.20.4 100
 5.3.9 98
 5.3.11 98
 6.16.3 100
 6.20.5 100
 7.17.3 99
 7.20.1 100
 8.71.1–2 100
Panegyricus
 46.4 239
 play in Greek 95–96
- Plutarch 163, 238–39, 260, 371
Cato Maior
 22.5 239
 23.2 238
Crassus
 33 371
Tiberius Gracchus
 17 163
 19 163
 21 163
- Pomponius
Ergastylus
 R³11. *Atellana* 45 8–9
- Pomponius Secundus 94, 131–32

<i>Aeneas</i>	474–484	185
<i>TrRF</i> I.4 Pomponius Secundus	485–487	186
<i>testimonia et fragmenta</i> 131–32	486–487	179
Priscian	491–494	179, 187
6.716	494–495	179
Propertius	496–497	179
4.3	497–498	186
	497–506	177, 179, 186
Quintilian	500	186
8.3.62	502	186
9.2.9	504	186
9.3.77	507–509	187
10.1	507–556	186
10.1.98	508–511	178
12.10.73	511–512	187
	512–516	187
Sallust	514	194
<i>Bellum Jugurthum</i>	517–520	187
31.7	517–526	178, 186
Scaevus Memor	522–526	187
<i>incert. fab.</i>	527	178
<i>TrRF</i> I.4 Scaevus Memor 1	528	179, 187
Semonides	528–532	187
fr. 7	528–538	179
Seneca	528–556	177, 187
1, 24–44, 93–94, 101–103, 105–17, 118–	532–533	187
50, 151–67, 171–75, 177–95, 209, 216, 226,	533–534	178
228, 232–35, 239–42, 245–59, 260–82,	539–540	179
311–29, 330–47, 348–63, 368–69, 376,	539–542	188
380–81, 386	540	179
<i>Agamemnon</i> 93, 101–102, 133, 141, 143, 175,	541–543	179
177, 179, 184–88, 192, 249, 261, 263, 266,	544	179
269–70	545–552	188
125–127	553–555	188
226–227	553–556	179
226–233	556	188
234–238	557	178
421–430	557–576	177
421–455	577	192
421–578	586–588	268
423	727–740	193
431–441	730	101
435–436	750–774	193
437–438	778–781	268
442–455	867	193
444	867–909	193
458–459	869–871	193
470	875–877	193
472–474		

Seneca *De clementia* (cont.)

875–880 193

881–896 193

897–903 193

904–909 193

916–917 268

947–950 268

978–979 268

1004–1012 141

Consolatio ad Polybium

11.2 242

De clementia 155, 249–50, 256–58

1.1.5 256

1.1.6 256

1.8.1 256

1.8.6–7 250

1.9.1 256

1.11.1–2 256

1.11.4–1.13.5 250

1.12.4 155, 257

1.13.5 258

1.14.2 256

1.19.5 256

2.2.2 155

2.2.2–3 257

De ira 155, 164–66, 249–50, 253, 257–58, 358

1.20 166

1.20.4 155

2.1.3–4 250

2.2.1–6 253

2.33 164–65

2.35.5 358

2.4.1–2 250

De providentia

2.10 254

2.11–12 254

Epistulae morales 163, 247, 252–54, 358,

363, 369

7 369

7.1–6 253

16.2 358

24.7 254

31.1 252

57.3–4 253

70.22 254

77.20 363

80.7 254

80.8 254

90.25 163

107.11 247

108.8 247

108.10 253

115.15 253

120.21–22 252

122.8 163

Hercules furens 105, 109, 133–34, 174–75,

180, 188–91, 247–49, 261, 264–67, 269,

314–15, 363, 381

64–68 109

192–201 247

309–311 264–65

329–331 267

332–353 269

332–357 267

637 267

640–644 267

646–649 180

650–651 180

650–839 134

662–827 171, 180

664 189

664–667 189

665 189

666 189

667 189

668–672 189

668–679 189

673–774 189

675–679 190

687–697 190

690 190

692 190

693 190

698–702 190

709–727 190

709–829 189

731–736 190

761 134

762–763 189, 190

783–797 191

797–804 191

806 180

807–812 191

813–827 191

818–821 180

- 939–1038 248
 955–973 113
 1341–1344 180
Hercules Oetaeus 93, 101, 105–17, 118, 134,
 143–45, 241, 255, 360–63, 368, 380
 1–17 106–107
 1–98 105
 1–705 105
 3 110, 115
 7–8 108, 111–12, 114
 8 110, 112
 8–10 109
 9–10 109, 112
 10 109
 11 109, 113
 11–12 110
 13 112
 13–14 105, 110
 14–15 110
 15 110
 16–27 110
 18 108
 19 110
 23–24 105, 110
 28–29 111
 29–32 111
 30 112, 114
 30–31 111
 32 112–13
 39 113
 40–45 113
 46–48 105
 51 114, 117
 54 114
 55 114
 55–56 114
 62 114
 64 115
 72–73 115
 79 105
 82 115
 87–98 116
 96 117
 104–172 144
 235–582 144
 583–706 144
 707–714 144
 742–884 144
 885–982 144
 982 145
 1031–1130 145
 1131–1336 145
 1137 145
 1419 145
 1419–1426 145
 1488–1496 145
 1518–1606 145
 1521–1524 361
 1609–1757 134
 1940–1943 255
 1963–1976 255
 1983 255
 1983–1996 145
 1984 255
 1988 255
Medea 93, 115, 133, 145, 162, 247–49,
 261–63, 266–67, 269–70, 323–24
 150–154 263
 177–178 267
 179–187 267, 269–70
 429–430 269
 431–432 270
 431–444 269
 738–739 261–62
 971–972 267
 978–981 267
Oedipus 133, 171, 247–49, 260–82, 323–26,
 330–47, 351–52, 358
 1–81a 266, 273
 12 273
 15 273
 15–27 273
 22 273
 23 273
 25 273
 26 273
 27 273
 81 260
 81b–82 265–266
 81b–86 266, 271
 81–102 271
 87–88 271
 233–238 281
 286 279
 288–289 277
 288–290 267

Seneca *Oedipus* (cont.)

291-292	267	250-254	249
299-391	358	384-386	267
372	358	387-403	267
530-547	325	424-425	262
530-658	171, 340	431	262
630-658	281	583	267
697-862	279	587	344
709-763	273	587-588	267
755-756	274	589-590	267
758	273	592-598	344
764	277	592-600	249
764-772	264	718	344
764-881	279	850-853	267
768	277	862	267
770-771	276	863	267
773-775	264, 277	864-867	267
776-783	277	978-988	247
782	278-79	1000-1003	180
782-783	277-78	1000-1014	171
783	277-78	1000-1114	25
784	260, 270, 277	1007-1008	31
790-792	280	1007-1034	25-26
823-824	267	1015	27, 29, 31
825-836	278-79	1025	26
830	280	1025-1026	180
833	280	1026	27
834	281	1027-1028	27
837	282	1030	27
838b-841a	267	1031	31
882-914	274	1033-1034	27
892-893	274	1035-1049	27
915-979	341	1036	26-28
965	358	1040-1041	34
980-982	274-75	1044	28
980-988	351-52	1045	28
980-997	274	1047	28
992-994	274-75	1047-1048	28, 34
995-997	275	1049	28
1004-1009	133	1050-1054	180
1040-1041	133	1050-1084	32-33
1051	341	1057-1059	43
		1059	29, 31, 43
		1059-1061	34
		1060-1063	33
		1066-1067	35
		1072-1075	35
		1072-1079	42
		1085-1104	35-36

Phaedra 24-44, 134-35, 144-45, 171,
 179-80, 182, 246-49, 261-63, 266-67,
 319-20, 323-24, 326, 330-31, 333,
 342-46
 112-128 248
 129-130 263

1086	42	242-243	161
1102-1104	36	244-248	256
1123-1127	247	264	163
1188-1190	326	265-266	386
1197	43	267	252
1198-2000	43	267-270	209
1244-1246	135	270	251
1244-1280	38	272-273	252
1247	135	274	252
1248	135	275-276	335
1249	38	277-278	336
1265-1268	38	283-286	251
1271-1274	135	288-289	159
1275	135	327-330	160
1277	135	334-335	165
1279	135	335	256
<i>Phoenissae</i>	94, 102-103, 228, 248-49, 342	344-403	247
<i>Thyestes</i>	133-34, 151-67, 171, 181, 209,	354	162
	247-52, 255-56, 258, 261-63, 265-66,	356	162
	268, 270, 314-15, 323-26, 330-47, 352,	375	162
	355, 386	378-379	162
	23-121	384	162
	24	396-397	163
	163	404-420	265
	52	429-430	265
	163	462	162
	56-57	464-465	162
	252	471	162
	176-180	491-493	270
	250	491-507	268
	176-191	495	268
	160	497-503	315
	176-204	498	162
	335	508-511	268
	177	526	162
	249	541-542	161
	179-180	546-595	247
	355	573-595	334
	180	578	162
	250	593	335
	190-191	602	162
	250	603	162
	192-193	623-640	181
	251	641-682	181
	195-196	641-782	171, 181
	251	646-647	163
	204-205	650-682	325
	263	652	181
	204-218		
	160		
	205-207		
	165		
	167		
	207		
	165, 167		
	207-211		
	258		
	208		
	165		
	211		
	258		
	212		
	165		
	223		
	162		
	225-233		
	160		
	225-234		
	335		
	234-235		
	160		
	239		
	162		
	239-240		
	160		

Seneca *Thyestes* (cont.)

- 657-664 161
 691-714 250
 707 162
 713-714 166
 718-719 181
 720-721 248
 757-758 163
 775 163
 782-783 181
 789-884 247
 789-1112 134
 885 166, 250, 262
 885-919 262
 888 250
 901-902 262
 903 166, 262
 903-919 262
 911 166
 911-912 166, 250
 912 250
 913-918 326
 918 262
 920-969 262
 963 262
 970-971 263
 982-983 161
 1006 252
 1053-1068 250
 1056-1057 250
 1066 250
 1098-1099 161
 1098-1102 160
 1104-1110 337
 1110-1111 338
 1112 338
- Troades* 39, 43-44, 118-50, 248-49, 261,
 264, 266-67, 376
 1-3 146
 1-4 138-39
 4 147
 4-6 147
 6-7 147
 9 148
 11 148
 12 148
 15 148
 15-17 148
- 18-19 149
 21 149
 22 149
 22-23 149
 28-66 149
 63-163 266
 181-183 139
 351-352 267
 360-371 267
 408-810 139
 412-413 139
 413 139
 428 139
 454-456 139-40
 462 140
 470-474 126
 471 140
 518 267
 522-523 267
 524-555 126, 267
 524-813 121
 547-551 140
 707-708 140
 736-738 126
 739-741 141
 740 143
 792 127
 861-871a 264
 861-1008 121
 871b-887 264
 999-1000a 267
 1000b-1008 267
 1009 135
 1010 135
 1025-1028 135
 1030-1033 135
 1050-1055 135
 1064 248
 1068-1071 39
 1068-1074 39
 1068-1103 135
 1071-1072 39
 1098-1099 248
 1103 135
 1118-1164 135
 1121-1125 44
 1128-1131 141
 1146 248

- 1159 248
 1165–1177 136
 1167 136
 1171–1177 136
 1177 136
 1178–1179 136
 ps.-Seneca
 Octavia 93, 101, 118, 143–47, 166, 216, 226,
 232–35, 241, 255–56, 258
 441 256
 442 256
 444 256
 449 256
 456 256
 457 258
 471–491 256
 482 256
 503–529 256
 524–526 256
 526 256
 Servius 128, 156–57, 161
 ad Aeneidam
 1.179 128
 8.130 157
 Sidonius Apollinaris 101, 246–47
 Carmina
 9.232–236 101, 247
 Sophocles 24, 29, 48–54, 56–57, 60–62, 80–81,
 83, 87, 133–34, 144, 214, 234, 255, 260,
 271–72, 279–80, 312, 314, 323, 339–42, 368
 Ajax 81
 Antigone 342
 Chryses 80
 Electra 234
 Medea 29
 Niptra 49–62
 TrGF IV F 451a 49
 Odysseus Akanthoplex 49–50, 53
 TrGF IV F 453–461 49
 Oedipus at Colonus 83, 87, 342
 Oedipus Rex 271–72, 279–80, 323, 339–42
 697–862 279
 715–716 279
 754 279
 754–755 279
 756 279
 765–769 279
 813 279
 813–816 279–80
 821–823 279–80
 822–823 280
 834–835 279
 843–844 279
 859–862 279
 Phaedra 24, 29
 Philoctetes 51, 260
 Shepherds 214
 Trachiniae 51, 57, 60–61, 133–34, 144, 255,
 368
 971–1278 57
 Traumatias Odysseus 49
 Strabo
 14.1.23 380
 Suetonius 41, 95–96, 103, 155, 167, 258,
 371
 Caligula
 30.1 155, 258
 Domitian
 10 371
 Nero
 21.3 41
 38 41
 45 371
 Terence
 4 95
 Tiberius
 45 371
 59.2 258
 Tacitus 41, 99–100, 103, 132, 155, 167, 216, 233,
 236, 254, 362
 Annales
 11.13 132
 13.17.9 167
 14.10 167
 14.12 167
 14.13 167
 14.59 167
 14.60 167
 14.64 167
 15.38–43 41
 15.62 362
 15.63–64 254
 Dialogus de Oratoribus 99–100, 155, 233,
 236
 2.1 100

- 3.1 100
 3.2 100
 3.3 100, 155
 Terence 1, 60, 95, 219, 260, 285, 287, 305–306,
 382
 Eunuchus
 590 306
 590–591 306
 Phormio 60, 305
 4–8 305
 138–139 60
 Titinius
 Protesilaus 214
 Titius
 Protesilaus 214
 Varius
 Thyestes 94–96, 232
 Varro 4, 16, 18–19, 76–78, 95, 131, 216, 220–21,
 227
 De lingua latina
 6.18–19 216
 6.60 131
 7.6 18
 7.82 16, 77
 Vergil 33–34, 128–29, 131, 141, 157, 174, 184–86,
 189–90, 197, 209, 225, 354
 Aeneid
 1.2 131
 1.35 184
 1.82–86 185
 1.94–101 186
 1.179 128
 2.199–231 33
 2.203–211 33
 3.196–197 185
 6 189
 6.273–281 190
 8.130 157
 9.186–187 209
 12.64–69 129
 Georgics
 3.232–234 34
 Verrius Flaccus
 De verborum significatu 45
 Vitruvius
 5.6.2 376